arXiv:1201.3562v1 [math.GR] 17 Jan 2012

On topological twin buildings and topological split Kac–Moody groups

Tobias Hartnick Ralf Köhl* Andreas Mars

January 18, 2012

Abstract

We prove that split Kac–Moody groups over local fields naturally lead to topological twin buildings in the sense of [Kra02]. We use this to classify all connected Moufang topological twin building, whose underlying Coxeter diagram contains no loop and no isolated vertices, in terms of local data. In the totally-disconnected case we obtain a similar classification for split Moufang topological twin buildings.

1 Introduction

The objective of topological geometry is to study (incidence) geometries, whose underlying sets are equipped with a topology with respect to which the natural geometric operations are continuous. Among the most prominent examples are the compact projective planes, i.e., projective planes whose point and line sets are compact Hausdorff spaces such that the maps that assign to two distinct points the unique line joining them and to two distinct lines the unique point incident to both are continuous maps. A detailled account on connected compact projective planes can be found in [SBG$^+$95]. The gate property of Tits buildings ([AB08, Section 4.9]) and the resulting projection maps between opposite panels generalize these geometric operations of joining points and intersecting lines in projective planes, thus leading to the concept of compact generalized polygons and, more generally, topological (spherical) buildings; see [BS87], [Kra94]. Various subclasses of these topological geometries have been classified, see for example [BS87], [GKK95], [GKK00], [SBG$^+$95].

An important extension of the class of spherical buildings is given by the class of twin buildings [Tit92]. By definition, a twin building consists of a pair of (possibly non-spherical) buildings together with a codistance function (or twinning), which allows one to define the notion of opposition and (co-)projections from one half of the twin building to the other extending the corresponding notions in the spherical case. While spherical twin buildings are just another way of looking at spherical buildings ([Tit92, Proposition 1]), in the non-spherical case it is a very rigid property for a building to be part of a twin building. The existence of co-projections in twin buildings opens the door for the development of a theory of topological twin buildings, by requiring co-projections to be continuous. In order to be able to develop a rich theory, it seems necessary to maintain some compactness assumption, for instance compactness of the panels. In the spherical case this assumption is equivalent to compactness of the whole building, whereas in the non-spherical case it is not.

An axiomatic definition of topological twin buildings along the lines just described was first given in [Kra02], where the author provides a geometric underpinning for the proof of Bott periodicity in [Mit88], which was based on a somewhat ad hoc notion of a topological BN pair. While the article [Kra02] describes in detail an explicit model of the twin building associated with a loop group, the theory is developed in an abstract way which is independent of the existence of such a model and hence does not rely on the underlying twin building being affine.

---

[*] né Gramlich

At the time of writing of [Kra02] examples of non-discrete, non-affine, non-spherical topological twin buildings were not well-understood—although in principle available through [KP83a], [Tit87]. During the last decade the theory of Kac-Moody groups [Rém02] and their group topologies [GGH10] has been developed to a point where many such examples can be described without problem. The purpose of the present article is twofold: On the one hand, to show that the examples of twin buildings associated with split Kac-Moody group over local fields are indeed topological twin buildings in the sense of Kramer; on the other hand, to revisit and extend the general theory in light of these new examples up to the point necessary to obtain partial classification results. An important feature of our presentation is that we treat the connected and the totally-disconnected case as well as the characteristic 0 and the positive characteristic case largely simultaneously.

The idea to use group topologies on certain Kac–Moody groups to construct new examples of topological twin buidlings was already suggested in the first author's master thesis [Har06], where a group-theoretic criterion for twin building topologies based on the theory of RGD systems is stated. However, carrying out this program—even in the case of complex Kac-Moody groups—became only possible after some rather technical insights concerning direct limit topologies had been obtained in [GGH10]. The case of positive characteristic presents additional algebraic difficulties. Nevertheless by combining ideas from [GGH10], [Har06], [Rém02] we are able to overcome these difficulties in order to show:

Theorem 1. *Let G be a two-spherical split Kac–Moody group over a (non-discrete) locally compact, σ-compact Hausdorff field. Then there exists a (non-discrete) Hausdorff group topology on G such that the associated twin building endowed with the quotient topology on each of its halves is a (non-discrete) topological twin building.*

Theorem 1 provides a rich supply of topological twin buildings. The condition that the diagram be 2-spherical is used in the proof of Proposition 5.19 in the guise of commutator relations (cf. also the end of Remark 5.16). It is then natural to ask whether a classification is possible under some natural conditions, mimicking known classification results in the spherical case. For the moment we are only able to contribute to this question in the situation where the underlying Coxeter diagram is 2-spherical and contains no loops. Under these assumptions the theory of abstract foundations [Müh99], [MR95], [RT87] implies that an abstract twin building is determined by its local data, and we are able to provide a topological version of this result in Theorem 6.4.

We present two applications of this local-to-global principle:

Firstly, let us call a topological twin building **k-split** if all its rank two residues are compact Moufang polygons and its rank one residues (considered as topological Moufang sets) are projective lines over k. Rank two residues of such twin buildings are either generalized triangles or quadrangles or hexagons, and similarly to the spherical case we can associated with every k-split topological twin building a Dynkin diagram. We then obtain the following classification result:

Theorem 2. *Let k be a non-discrete, locally compact, σ-compact Hausdorff field. The map which associates to every topological twin building its Dynkin diagram defines a bijection between isomorphism classes of k-split Moufang topological twin buildings of tree type and isomorphisms classes of simply-connected simple $\{3, 4, 6\}$-labelled graphs, where edged labelled 4 or 6 are directed.*

Using the concept of normal coverings of Coxeter diagrams from [Müh99] it is actually possible to extend the above classification to k-split Moufang topological twin buildings of arbitrary type, but we refrain from doing so in the present article. We simply note that for arbitrary diagrams the Moufang foundation will not uniquely determine the twin building (cf. also the discussion on page 31 before Theorem 6.4).

In the situation where the twin building in question is additionally connected and 2-spherical we can in fact obtain a classification result beyond the split case in terms of local data. Let us call a Coxeter system (W, S) admissible, if it is two-spherical and its Coxeter graph contains neither loops nor isolated vertices. Given an admissible system, we define the notion of a **topological Moufang foundation** of type (W, S) in Definition 6.2. A topological Moufang foundation is called **connected** if all its rank-2 residues are connected. All connected topological Moufang foundations of admissible type are known in the sense that they can be constructed from simple

Lie groups. Moreover, the isomorphism problem for connected Moufang sets has been solved in [Kra03] (see also [Tit52], [Tit55], [Tit56]). Every connected twin building of admissible type gives rise to a connected topological foundation, and we call the twin building **Moufang**, if its foundation is Moufang. Then we have the following classification result:

Theorem 3. *The isomorphisms classes of connected Moufang topological twin buildings of admissible type are in bijection with isomorphism classes of connected topological Moufang foundations of admissible type.*

Again the concept of normal coverings from [Müh99] would allow one to remove the hypothesis that the diagram contain no loops. Before the above result can be generalized to the totally-disconnected case, a solution for the isomorphism problem for (totally disconneced topological) Moufang sets needs to be available.

This article is organized as follows: In Section 2 we recall basic definitions concerning twin buildings and RGD systems. We then establish a couple of basic combinatorial properties of twin buildings. The main new result is Theorem 2.20, where we provide an explicit formulas for co-projections in the twin building associated with an RGD system in terms of group data. Section 3 introduces topological twin buildings and develops their basic point-set topological properties. Our main contribution here is a local-to-global result (Theorem 3.17), which was previously only known in the spherical case, with a different proof. Ours is based on the concept of Bott–Samelson desingularizations of Schubert varieties taken from [Kra02]. Section 4 provides the link between topological twin systems and topological groups with RGD systems. We provide a list of conditions on the topology of such a group, which guarantee that the associated twin building becomes a topological twin building when equipped with the quotient topology (see Theorem 4.8). In Section 5 this result is applied to the case of split Kac-Moody groups over a local field. We introduce a topology on these groups (generalizing the construction of [KP83a] in the complex case) and establish Theorem 1. In Section 6 we combine this result with our local-to-global theorem 3.17 in order to establish our first classification result (Theorem 2). The final section is devoted to the special case of connected topological twin buildings and the refined classification results of Theorem 3.

Acknowledgements. The authors thank Peter Abramenko, Helge Glöckner, Guntram Hainke, Aloysius Helminck, Linus Kramer, Bernhard Mühlherr, Andrei Rapinchuk, Nils Rosehr, Markus Stroppel and Stefan Witzel for several valuable comments, questions and discussions concerning the topic of the present article.

2 Twin buildings and RGD systems

2.1 Twin buildings and their combinatorics

Buildings can be studied from the point of view of simplicial complexes (as done in [Tit74]) or, equivalently, from the point of view of chamber systems (as introduced in [Tit81]). The book [AB08] is a comprehensive introduction into the theory of buildings that explains both concepts in detail, also including the theory of twin buildings.

In the present article we will study twin building topologies using the chamber system approach to buildings. By Corollary 3.21 below these topologies are in fact independent of whether one uses the chamber system or the simplicial complex point of view. Throughout this article we reserve the letters (W, S) to deserve a Coxeter system, which is always assume to be of finite rank $|S|$. We then denote by $\leq$ the associated Bruhat order and by $l = l_S$ the associated length function on W.

Definition 2.1. Let (W, S) be a Coxeter system. A **building** of type (W, S) is a pair (Δ, δ) consisting of a set of chambers Δ together with a distance function $\delta : \Delta \times \Delta \to W$ satisfying the following axioms, where $x, y \in \Delta$ and $\delta(x, y) = w$:

(Bu1) $w = 1$ if and only if $x = y$,

(Bu2) if $z \in \Delta$ such that $\delta(y, z) = s \in S$, then $\delta(x, z) \in \{ws, w\}$. If additionally $l(ws) > l(w)$, then $\delta(x, z) = ws$.

(Bu3) If $s \in S$, there exists $z \in \Delta$ such that $\delta(y, z) = s$ and $\delta(x, z) = ws$.

A building is called **spherical** if W is finite. If Δ is spherical, then $c, d \in \Delta$ are called **opposite**, if $\delta(c, d) = w_0$, where w_0 denotes the longest element of (W, S). For every $c \in \Delta$ and every subset $S' \subseteq S$ we define the **S'-residue** $R_{S'}(c)$ to be

$$R_{S'}(c) := \{d \in \Delta \mid \delta(c, d) \in \langle s \mid s \in S' \rangle\};$$

the collection of all S'-residues in Δ will be denoted $\mathrm{Res}_{S'}(\Delta)$.

Remark 2.2. Using the above definition a building of rank one is simply a set without further structure. In order to be able to develop a meaningful theory for such buildings, one has to require additional properties, such as the existence of a prescribed rank one group of automorphisms; cf. [DMS09], [Tim01]. In the present article we will not deal with this situation and therefore only study buildings whose Coxeter systems/Dynkin diagrams do not admit isolated points.

Lemma 2.3 ([AB08, Lemma 5.16 and Corollary 5.30])**.** *Any residue of a building Δ is again a building. For any $S' \subseteq S$ the elements of $\mathrm{Res}_{S'}(\Delta)$ partition Δ.*

Residues of rank or co-rank one play a special role: Those of rank one, i.e., the elements of $\mathrm{Pan}_s(\Delta) := \mathrm{Res}_{\{s\}}(\Delta)$ are called ***s*-panels**; as a convention, we write $P_s(c)$ instead of $R_{\{s\}}(c)$. The residues of co-rank one, i.e., the elements of $\mathcal{V}_s := \mathrm{Res}_{S \backslash \{s\}}(\Delta)$ are called ***s*-vertices**. There is a canonical embedding

$$\begin{aligned} \iota : \Delta &\hookrightarrow \prod_{s \in S} \mathcal{V}_s \\ c &\mapsto \left(R_{S \backslash \{s\}}(c)\right)_{s \in S}, \end{aligned}$$

which, from the simplicial complexes point of view on buildings, simply maps a maximal simplex onto the tuple consisting of its vertices.

A building is **thin**, if each panel contains exactly two elements, and **thick**, if each panel contains at least three elements. For a given chamber c and a residue R there exists a unique chamber $d \in R$ such that

$$l(\delta(c, d)) = \min\{l(\delta(c, x)) \mid x \in R\},$$

see [AB08, Proposition 5.34]. This chamber d is called the **projection** of c onto R and is denoted by $\mathrm{proj}_R(c)$.

Example 2.4. Let (W, S) be a Coxeter system. Then $\Delta := W$ and $\delta : \Delta \times \Delta \to W : (x, y) \mapsto x^{-1}y$ yields a (thin) building of type (W, S), denoted by $\Delta(W, S)$. For any three chambers $x, y, z \in \Delta$ one has $\delta(x, z) = x^{-1}z = x^{-1}yy^{-1}z = \delta(x, y)\delta(y, z)$; see also [AB08, Lemma 5.55]. Any thin building of type (W, S) is isometric to $\Delta(W, S)$, cf. [AB08, Exercise 4.12].

Let Δ be a building of type (W, S). A subset of Δ which is isometric to $\Delta(W, S)$ is called an **apartment** of Δ.

Definition 2.5. A **twin building** of type (W, S) is a triple $((\Delta_+, \delta_+), (\Delta_-, \delta_-), \delta^*)$ consisting of two buildings (Δ_+, δ_+) and (Δ_-, δ_-) of type (W, S) and a **codistance** function $\delta^* : (\Delta_+ \times \Delta_-) \cup (\Delta_- \times \Delta_+) \to W$ subject to the following conditions, where $x \in \Delta_\pm$, $y \in \Delta_\mp$ and $\delta^*(x, y) = w$:

(Tw1) $\delta^*(y, x) = w^{-1}$,

(Tw2) if $z \in \Delta_\mp$ such that $\delta_\mp(y, z) = s \in S$, and $l(ws) < l(w)$, then $\delta^*(x, z) = ws$, and

(Tw3) if $s \in S$, then there exists $z \in \Delta_\mp$ such that $\delta_\mp(y, z) = s$ and $\delta^*(x, z) = ws$.

Morphisms of twin buildings are defined as follows:

Definition 2.6. For $j \in \{1,2\}$ let $\Delta^{(j)} = ((\Delta_+^{(j)}, \delta_+^{(j)}), (\Delta_-^{(j)}, \delta_-^{(j)}), \delta^{*,(j)})$ be twin buildings such that the type $(W^{(1)}, S^{(1)})$ is a sub-Coxeter system of the type $(W^{(2)}, S^{(2)})$. A **morphism** of twin buildings $\varphi : \Delta^{(1)} \to \Delta^{(2)}$ is an isometry

$$\varphi : \Delta_+^{(1)} \cup \Delta_-^{(1)} \to \Delta_+^{(2)} \cup \Delta_-^{(2)},$$

i.e., a map that preserves distances and codistances.

Example 2.7. Let (W,S) be any Coxeter system and let $\Delta_\pm := W$ and $\delta_\pm$ as in Example 2.4. Moreover, define $\delta^* : (\Delta_+ \times \Delta_-) \cup (\Delta_- \times \Delta_+) \to W$ by $\delta^*(v,w) := v^{-1}w$. Then $((\Delta_+, \delta_+), (\Delta_-, \delta_-), \delta^*)$ is a thin twin building, and any thin twin building of type (W,S) is isometric to this twin building, cf. [AB08, Exercise 5.164]. In this case the distance and the codistance function are related by the formula

$$\delta^*(x,z) = x^{-1}z = x^{-1}yy^{-1}z = \delta^*(x,y)\delta_\mp(y,z), \quad x \in \Delta_\pm, y, z \in \Delta_\mp;$$

see also [AB08, Lemma 5.173(4)].

A subset ot a twin building isomorphic to a thin twin building is called a **twin apartment**. Twin apartments are closely related to the notion of opposition. Here two chambers $c \in \Delta_\pm$, $d \in \Delta_\mp$ are called **opposite**, if $\delta^*(c,d) = 1$. Every pair of opposite chambers is contained in a unique twin apartment by [AB08, Proposition 5.179(1)]. Conversely, a pair of apartments (Σ_+, Σ_-) forms a twin apartment if and only if each chamber in $\Sigma_\pm$ is opposite to exactly one chamber of $\Sigma_\mp$; cf. [AB08, Proposition 5.173(5)].

The notion of opposition can be extended to residues by calling two residues **opposite**, if they have the same type and contain a pair of opposite chambers. Any pair of opposite residues is a twin building with respect to the restrictions of the distance and co-distance functions, cf. [AB08, Exercise 5.166].

Given a spherical residue $R \subseteq \Delta_\pm$ and a chamber $c \in \Delta_\mp$, there exists a unique chamber $d \in R$ such that $\delta^*(c,d)$ is of maximal length in the set $\delta^*(c,R)$ with respect to the Bruhat order, cf. [AB08, Lemma 5.149]. This chamber d is called the **co-projection** of c onto R and is denoted by $\mathrm{proj}_R^*(c)$.

Given a chamber $c \in \Delta_\pm$ and an element $w \in W$ we denote by

$$\begin{aligned} E_w(c) &:= \{d \in \Delta_\pm \mid \delta_\varepsilon(c,d) = w \in W\}, \\ E_w^*(c) &:= \{d \in \Delta_\mp \mid \delta^*(c,d) = w \in W\} \end{aligned}$$

the **Schubert cell**, respectively, **co-Schubert cell** of radius w and center c. The sets $E_{\leq w}(c), E_{<w}(c), E_{\leq w}^*(c), E_{<w}^*(c)$ are defined accordingly. $E_{\leq w}(c)$ and $E_{\leq w}^*(c)$ are called **Schubert varieties**, respectively, **co-Schubert varieties**. Moreover, we define

$$\Delta_w := \{(c,d) \in (\Delta_+ \times \Delta_-) \cup (\Delta_- \times \Delta_+) \mid \delta^*(c,d) = w\}.$$

The following combinatorial observations concerning twin buildings are quite useful.

Lemma 2.8. *Let Δ be a twin building, let $s, t \in S$, let $c_1, c_2 \in \Delta_+$ such that $\delta_+(c_1, c_2) = s$, and let $d \in \Delta_-$ such that $\{(c_1, d), (c_2, d)\} \subset \Delta_1$. Then $\mathrm{proj}_{P_t(d)}^*(c_1) = \mathrm{proj}_{P_t(d)}^*(c_2)$.*

Proof. Let $a_1 := \mathrm{proj}_{P_t(d)}^*(c_1)$. Then $\delta^*(c_1, a_1) = t$, whence $\delta^*(c_2, a_1) \in \{t, st\}$ by [AB08, Lemma 5.139]. On the other hand, $\delta^*(c_2, d) = 1$ and, thus, $\delta^*(c_2, a_1) \in \{1, t\}$ by [AB08, Lemma 5.139]. We conclude $\delta^*(c_2, a_1) = t$ and so $\mathrm{proj}_{P_t(d)}^*(c_1) = a_1 = \mathrm{proj}_{P_t(d)}^*(c_2)$. $\square$

Lemma 2.9 ([AB08, Lemma 5.156])**.** *Let Δ be a thick twin building. Then for every pair $c_1, c_2 \in \Delta_\pm$ there exists $d \in \Delta_\mp$ such that $\{(c_1, d), (c_2, d)\} \subset \Delta_1$.*

Let $c \in \Delta_\pm$ be a chamber and let Σ be a twin apartment of Δ containing c. Then the map $\rho = \rho_{c,\Sigma} : \Delta \to \Sigma$ which fixes c pointwise and maps every apartment containing c isometrically onto Σ is called the **retraction** onto Σ centred at c. Since every two chambers are contained in a common twin apartment ([AB08, Proposition 5.179(3)]), the retraction ρ preserves distances from c. Moreover, ρ is distance-decreasing, i.e., $\delta(\rho(d), \rho(e)) \leq \delta(d, e)$ for any two chambers $d, e \in \Delta$, where δ is to be interpreted as δ_+, δ_- or δ^*, whichever one makes sense.

Lemma 2.10 ([AB08, Lemma 5.140(1)]). *Let $c \in \Delta_\pm$, $d, e \in \Delta_\mp$ be chambers, let $\delta^*(c, d) = w$, and let $\delta_\mp(d, e) = v$. Then $\delta^*(c, e) = wv'$, where v' is a subexpression of v.*

Proof. Let $\rho = \rho_{c,\Sigma}$ be the retraction map onto some twin apartment Σ containing c. Then $\delta^*(c, \rho(d)) = \delta^*(c, d) = w$ as ρ preserves distances from c. Since ρ is distance-decreasing, one has $\delta_\mp(\rho(d), \rho(e)) \leq v$. We conclude

$$\begin{aligned} \delta^*(c, e) &= \delta^*(c, \rho(e)) \\ &\overset{2.7}{=} \delta^*(c, \rho(d))\delta_\mp(\rho(d), \rho(e)) \in \{wv' \mid v' \leq v\}. \qquad \square \end{aligned}$$

Lemma 2.11. *Let Δ be a thick twin building, let $1 \neq w = s_1 \cdots s_k \in W$ be reduced, and let $c_\pm \in \Delta_\pm$ be opposite chambers. Then there exists a chamber $d \in \Delta_-$ with $\delta^*(c_+, d) = 1$ and $\delta^*(E^*_w(c_-), d) = \{s_k\}$.*

Proof. By the definition of co-projections (see above or [AB08, Lemma 5.149]) there is a unique chamber $a \in P_{s_1}(c_-)$ such that $\delta^*(c_+, a) = s_1$. Since Δ is thick, there exists $a_1 \in P_{s_1}(c_-)\backslash\{c_-, a\}$. Then $\delta^*(c_+, a_1) = 1$ and, by axiom (Tw2), for all $x \in E^*_w(c_-)$ one has $\delta^*(a_1, x) = s_2 \cdots s_k$. By induction we obtain a gallery $a_1, \ldots, a_{k-1}$ such that $\delta^*(c_+, a_i) = 1$ and such that for all $x \in E^*_w(c_-)$ one has $\delta^*(a_i, x) = s_{i+1} \cdots s_k$. Thus the chamber $d := a_{k-1}$ has the desired properties. $\square$

2.2 Twin buildings from RGD systems

A group G **acts by isometries** on a twin building $\Delta = ((\Delta_+, \delta_+), (\Delta_-, \delta_-), \delta^*)$ if it acts on each half and preserves the distances and the codistance. A twin building is called **homogeneous** if it admits a group action by isometries which is transitive on each half.

In this section we describe a class of homogeneous twin buildings using group theory. For the necessary background information on reflection groups and their associated root systems we refer to [AB08, Section 1.5] or to [Hum92]. For more details on RGD systems we strongly recommend to consult [AB08, Chapters 7, 8] or [CR09]

Definition 2.12. Let G be a group and let $\{U_\alpha\}_{\alpha\in\Phi}$ be a family of subgroups of G, indexed by some root system Φ of type (W, S), let Φ^+ be a subset of positive roots, and let T be a subgroup of G. The triple $(G, \{U_\alpha\}_{\alpha\in\Phi}, T)$ is called an **RGD system** of type (W, S) if it satisfies the following assertions.

(RGD0) For each root $\alpha \in \Phi$, one has $U_\alpha \neq \{1\}$.

(RGD1) For each prenilpotent pair $\{\alpha, \beta\} \subseteq \Phi$ of distinct roots, one has $[U_\alpha, U_\beta] \subseteq \langle U_\gamma \mid \gamma \in]\alpha, \beta[\rangle$.

(RGD2) For each $s \in S$ there exists a function $\mu_s : U_{\alpha_s}\backslash\{1\} \to G$ such that for all $u \in U_{\alpha_s}\backslash\{1\}$ and $\alpha \in \Phi$ one has $\mu_s(u) \in U_{-\alpha_s} u U_{-\alpha_s}$ and $\mu_s(u)U_\alpha\mu_s(u)^{-1} = U_{s(\alpha)}$.

(RGD3) For each $s \in S$ one has $U_{-\alpha_s} \nsubseteq U_+ := \langle U_\alpha \mid \alpha \in \Phi^+\rangle$.

(RGD4) $G = T.\langle U_\alpha \mid \alpha \in \Phi\rangle$.

(RGD5) The group T normalises every U_α.

The tuple $(\{U_\alpha\}_{\alpha\in\Phi}, T)$ is called a **root group datum**, the U_α are called the **root subgroups**, and the $G_\alpha := \langle U_{\pm\alpha}\rangle$ are called the **rank one subgroups**.

A root group datum $(\{U_\alpha\}_{\alpha\in\Phi}, T)$ is called **$\mathbb{F}$-locally split** if T is abelian and if there is a field $\mathbb{F}$ such that $G_\alpha \cong (\mathrm{P})\mathrm{SL}_2(\mathbb{F})$ and $\{U_\alpha, U_{-\alpha}\}$ is isomorphic to the canonical root group datum of $(\mathrm{P})\mathrm{SL}_2(\mathbb{F})$. The RGD system is called **centred** if G is generated by its root subgroups, i.e., if $G = \langle U_\alpha \mid \alpha \in \Phi\rangle$.

Root group data give rise to BN-pairs in the sense of the following definition:

Definition 2.13. Let G be a group and let B, N be subgroups of G. The pair (B, N) is called a **BN-pair** for G, if G is generated by B and N, the intersection $T := B \cap N$ is normal in N, and the quotient group $W := N/T$ admits a set of generating involutions S such that

(BN1) for all $w \in W$ and $s \in S$ one has $wBs \subseteq BwsB \cup BwB$, and

(BN2) $sBs \not\subseteq B$ for each $s \in S$.

Two BN-pairs (B_+, N) and (B_-, N) of the same group G satisfying $B_+ \cap N = B_- \cap N$ yield a **twin BN-pair** (B_+, B_-, N), if the following additional assertions hold:

(TBN1) for $\varepsilon \in \{+, -\}$ and all $w \in W$, $s \in S$ such that $l(sw) < l(w)$, one has $B_\varepsilon s B_\varepsilon w B_{-\varepsilon} = B_\varepsilon sw B_{-\varepsilon}$, and

(TBN2) for each $s \in S$ one has $B_+ s \cap B_- = \emptyset$.

If B, N is a BN-pair for G and S is as above then the quadruple (G, B, N, S) is called a **Tits system** with **Weyl group** W. The notion of a **twin Tits system** (G, B_+, B_-, N, S) is defined accordingly. We remark that the pair (W, S) is a Coxeter system; cf. [AB08, Theorem 6.56(1)].

A group G with a BN-pair admits a **Bruhat decomposition** $G = \bigsqcup_{w\in W} BwB$, cf. [AB08, Theorems 6.17 and 6.56(1)], and a group G with a twin BN-pair admits a **Birkhoff decomposition** $G = \bigsqcup_{w\in W} B_\varepsilon w B_{-\varepsilon}$, cf. [AB08, Proposition 6.81]. The groups B_+, B_- and their conjugates are called **Borel subgroups**.

Important examples arise from root group data:

Proposition 2.14 ([AB08, Theorem 8.80]). *Let G be a group with a root group datum $(\{U_\alpha\}_{\alpha\in\Phi}, T)$ of type (W, S) and for each $s \in S$ let $\mu_s : U_{\alpha_s}\backslash\{1\} \to U_{-\alpha_s}U_{\alpha_s}U_{-\alpha_s}$ be the map provided by* (RGD2). *Then the groups*

$$\begin{aligned} N &:= T.\langle \mu_s(u) \mid u \in U_\alpha\backslash\{1\}, s \in S\rangle, \\ B_+ &:= T.U_+, \\ B_- &:= T.U_- \end{aligned}$$

yield a twin BN-pair (B_+, B_-, N) of the group G.

For a twin Tits system (G, B_+, B_-, N, S) with Weyl group W define $\Delta_\pm := G/B_\pm$. Given $gB_\pm, hB_\pm \in \Delta_\pm$ using the Bruhat decomposition let

$$\delta_\pm(gB_\pm, hB_\pm) := w \in W \quad \text{if and only if} \quad B_\pm g^{-1} h B_\pm = B_\pm w B_\pm.$$

Similarly using the Birkhoff decomposition instead, given $gB_\pm \in \Delta_\pm$ and $hB_\mp \in \Delta_\mp$ let

$$\delta^*(gB_\pm, hB_\mp) := w \in W \quad \text{if and only if} \quad B_\pm g^{-1} h B_\mp = B_\pm w B_\mp.$$

Then $((\Delta_+, \delta_+), (\Delta_-, \delta_-), \delta^*)$ is a twin building of type (W, S), see [AB08, Theorem 6.56 and Definition 6.82].

Definition 2.15. The above twin building is denoted

$$\Delta(G, B_+, B_-, N, S) := ((\Delta_+, \delta_+), (\Delta_-, \delta_-), \delta^*)$$

and referred to as the twin building **associated with** the twin Tits system (G, B_+, B_-, N, S). If the twin Tits system arises from a RGD system $(\{U_\alpha\}_{\alpha\in\Phi}, T)$, then the associated twin building is also denoted by $\Delta(G, \{U_\alpha\}_{\alpha\in\Phi}, T)$.

2.3 A formula for co-projections onto panels

Let G be a group with root group datum $(\{U_\alpha\}_{\alpha\in\Phi}, T)$ and let

$$\Delta := \Delta(G, \{U_\alpha\}_{\alpha\in\Phi}, T) = ((\Delta_+, \delta_+), (\Delta_-, \delta_-), \delta^*)$$

be the associated twin building. The goal of this section is to derive a formula for co-projections (cf. [AB08, Lemma 5.149]) onto panels of Δ in terms of the group structure of G.

Lemma 2.16. *Let B_- be the Borel subgroup associated to the chamber c_- of Δ_-, let $c \in \Delta_+$ be a chamber, and let $\delta^*(c_-, c) = w$. Then $B_-.c = B_- w B_+$. In particular, $B_-.c$ is represented by a unique double coset of the Birkhoff decomposition and every such double coset corresponds to a B_--orbit.*

Proof. The first statement is evident, as $\delta^*(B_-, gB_+) = \delta^*(c_-, c) = w$ if and only if $B_-.c = B_- g B_+ = B_- w B_+$. By [AB08, Lemma 6.70] the group B_- acts transitively on the chambers at codistance w from c_-, which implies the second statement. □

Lemma 2.17. *Let B_+, B_- be the opposite Borel subgroups provided by Proposition 2.14. Then $w^{-1}B_+ w B_- \subseteq B_+ B_-$.*

Proof. We proceed by an induction on $l(w)$. As the case $l(w) = 0$ is trivial, we may assume $l(w) > 0$. Then there exist $s \in S$, $w' \in W$ such that $w = sw'$ and $l(w) = l(w') + 1$. For $x \in B_+ w B_-$ we have $sx \in B_+ s B_+ w B_- \overset{(TBN1)}{=} B_+ sw B_- = B_+ w' B_-$. Therefore, by induction, $w^{-1}x = {w'}^{-1} sx \in {w'}^{-1} B_+ w' B_- \subseteq B_+ B_-$. □

Remark 2.18. The multiplication map $m\colon U_+ \times T \times U_- \to B_+ B_- : (u_+, t, u_-) \mapsto u_+ t u_-$ is bijective by [AB08, Section 8.8]. Therefore also

$$\begin{array}{rcl} \psi\colon B_- \hookrightarrow B_+B_- & \to & U_+ \backslash B_+ B_- \\ b_- & \mapsto & U_+ b_- \end{array}$$

is a bijection and allows one to define a map

$$\begin{array}{rcl} \pi\colon B_+B_- & \to & B_- \\ x & \mapsto & \psi^{-1}(U_+ x). \end{array}$$

Finally, for $w \in W$, Lemma 2.17 allows one to define

$$\begin{array}{rcl} \rho_w\colon B_+ w B_- & \to & B_-, \\ x & \mapsto & \pi(w^{-1}x). \end{array}$$

Proposition 2.19. *Let $x \in B_+ w B_-$. Then $x \in B_+ w \rho_w(x)$.*

Proof. By the Birkhoff decomposition of G there exist $u_\varepsilon \in U_\varepsilon$, $w \in W$, $t \in T$ such that $x = u_+ w t u_-$. Since $w^{-1} u_+ w \in U_+ U_-$, there exist $u_\varepsilon^1 \in U_\varepsilon \cap w^{-1} U_+ w$ such that $w^{-1} u_+ w = u_+^1 u_-^1$, whence $x = w w^{-1} u_+ w t u_- = w u_+^1 u_-^1 t u_-$. Thus $w^{-1}x = u_+^1 u_-^1 t u_-$, so $\rho_w(x) = u_-^1 t u_-$, and therefore $x = w u_+^1 \rho_w(x)$. As $u_+^1 \in U_+ \cap w^{-1} U_+ w$, there exists $u_2 \in U_+$ such that $u_+^1 = w^{-1} u_2 w$. We conclude $x = w u_+^1 \rho_w(x) = u_2 w \rho_w(x) \in B_+ w \rho_w(x)$. □

We can now establish an explicit formula for co-projections onto panels:

Theorem 2.20 ([Har06]). *Let $(G, \{U_\alpha\}_{\alpha\in\Phi})$ be an RGD system, let Δ be the associated twin building, let (W, S) be the associated Weyl group, let $c_+ = gB_+ \in \Delta_+$, let $c_- = hB_- \in \Delta_-$, let $\delta^*(c_+, c_-) = w \in W$, and let $s \in S$ such that $l(ws) > l(w)$. Then $\operatorname{proj}^*_{P_s(c_-)}(c_+) = h\rho_w(g^{-1}h)^{-1} s B_-$.*

Proof. One needs to prove that

$$\delta^*(gB_+, h\rho_w(g^{-1}h)^{-1}sB_-) = ws$$

and

$$\delta_-(hB_-, h\rho_w(g^{-1}h)^{-1}sB_-) = s.$$

Since $\delta^*(gB_+, hB_-) = w$, we have $g^{-1}h \in B_+wB_-$. Proposition 2.19 allows us to conclude that there exists $b_+ \in B_+$ such that $g^{-1}h = b_+w\rho_w(g^{-1}h)$, whence $g^{-1} = b_+w\rho_w(g^{-1}h)h^{-1}$. Therefore

$$g^{-1}h\rho_w(g^{-1}h)^{-1}s = b_+w\rho_w(g^{-1}h)h^{-1}h\rho_w(g^{-1}h)^{-1}s = b_+ws \in B_+wsB_-,$$

which shows that $\delta^*(gB_+, h\rho_w(g^{-1}h)^{-1}sB_-) = ws$. Similarly,

$$h^{-1}h\rho_w(g^{-1}h)^{-1}s = \rho_w(g^{-1}h)^{-1}s \in B_-sB_-,$$

and so $\delta_-(hB_-, h\rho_w(g^{-1}h)^{-1}sB_-) = s$. □

Corollary 2.21. *Let $(G, \{U_\alpha\}_{\alpha\in\Phi})$ be an RGD system, let Δ be the associated twin building, let (W, S) be the associated Weyl group, let $c_+ = gB_+ \in \Delta_+$, and let $c_- = hB_- \in \Delta_-$. If $\delta^*(c_+, c_-) = 1 \in W$, then for each $s \in S$ one has $\mathrm{proj}^*_{P_s(c_-)}(c_+) = h\pi(g^{-1}h)^{-1}sB_-$.*

Proof. This follows from Theorem 2.20, as $\rho_1 = \pi$. □

In Sections 3 and 5 we will use these projection formulae in order to derive the continuity of co-projections; in that context the following observation will become important:

Lemma 2.22. *Let τ be a group topology on G and equip T, $U_\pm$ with the subspace topologies. Assume that the continuous bijection $m\colon U_+ \times T \times U_- \to B_+B_-$ is open, i.e., a homeomorphism. Then ρ_w is continuous.*

Proof. If m is open, also ψ is open and, therefore, π and ρ_w are continuous. □

3 Topological twin buildings

3.1 Axioms for topological twin buildings

Throughout this section let $\Delta = ((\Delta_+, \delta_+), (\Delta_-, \delta_-), \delta^*)$ be a thick twin building of type (W, S). A topology τ on $\Delta_+ \cup \Delta_-$ will be referred to as a topology on Δ. Given such a topology, we equip the vertex sets $\mathcal{V}_s^\pm$, $s \in S$, with the quotient topologies with respect to the canonical maps $\Delta_\pm \to \mathcal{V}_s^\pm$. The following is a (non-exhaustive) list of properties that one might want to demand from such a topology τ. We recall that a space X is the direct limit of subspaces X_i, denoted $X = \lim_\to X_i$ if $X = \bigcup X_i$ and $U \subset X$ is open iff $U \cap X_i$ for all $i \in I$.

(TTB1) τ is a Hausdorff topology.

$\frac{1}{2}$(TTB2) For each $s \in S$ and each $c \in \Delta_\pm$ the map

$$\begin{array}{rcl} E_1^*(c) & \to & \Delta_+ \cup \Delta_- \\ d & \mapsto & \mathrm{proj}^*_{P_s(c)}(d) \end{array}$$

is continuous.

(TTB2) For each $s \in S$ the map

$$\begin{array}{l} p_s : \Delta_1 \to \Delta_+ \cup \Delta_- \\ \quad (c, d) \mapsto \mathrm{proj}^*_{P_s(c)}(d) \end{array}$$

is continuous.

(TTB3) There exist chambers $c_\pm \in \Delta_\pm$ such that

$$\Delta_\pm = \lim_{\to} E_{\leq w}(c_\pm).$$

(TTB3+) For every chamber $c_\pm \in \Delta_\pm$,

$$\Delta_\pm = \lim_{\to} E_{\leq w}(c_\pm).$$

(TTB4) For each $s \in S$ there exists a compact panel $P \in \mathrm{Pan}_s(\Delta_\pm)$.

(TTB4+) For each $s \in S$ every panel $P \in \mathrm{Pan}_s(\Delta_\pm)$ is compact.

(TTB5) The set $\Delta_1 = \{(c,d) \in (\Delta_+ \times \Delta_-) \cup (\Delta_- \times \Delta_+) \mid \delta^*(c,d) = 1\}$ of opposite chambers is open.

(TTB6) For every $s \in S$ the canonical map $\Delta_\pm \to \mathcal{V}_s^\pm$ is open.

(TTB7) The diagonal embedding

$$\begin{array}{rcl} \iota : \Delta_\pm & \hookrightarrow & \prod_{s \in S} \mathcal{V}_s^\pm \\ c & \mapsto & \big(R_{S \setminus \{s\}}(c)\big)_{s \in S} \end{array}$$

is a homeomorphism onto its image.

Kramer's original definition of a topological twin building [Kra02, p. 169] demanded axioms (TTB1), (TTB2), (TTB4+) and (TTB7) to hold.[1] Here (TTB1) and (TTB2) are the core axioms, whereas (TTB7) is a mere commodity. On the other hand, axiom (TTB4+) provides a rather severe restriction, which may seem unmotivated. However, several attempts to develop a substantial theory of spherical topological buildings beyond the case of compact panels have failed, so it seems reasonable to insist on this axiom. In any case, we will slightly modify Kramer's definition:

Definition 3.1. The pair (Δ, τ) is called a **topological twin building** if it satisfies axioms (TTB1), (TTB2), (TTB3), (TTB4), (TTB5), and (TTB6).

A **morphism** of a topological twin buildings is a morphism of the underlying twin buildings that, additionally, is continuous with respect to the twin building topologies.

Let us briefly discuss the differences between our system of axioms and the original one. The difference between axiom (TTB4) and (TTB4+) is merely cosmetic; we will see that (TTB4) actually implies (TTB4+), so we prefer to work with the former axiom. (TTB5) holds in all the examples we know, and can actually be derived from the other axioms in many cases (see Lemma 4.1). It seems possible that it is a consequence the other axioms, but we were not able to prove this in general. In any case, it is only used twice: Firstly, in the proof of Proposition 3.2 and secondly at one point in the proof of Proposition 7.6 via Proposition 3.23 (which in the two-spherical case is known to hold without assuming (TTB5) as discussed in Section 3.6). It certainly does not play a mayor role for the theory. The condition (TTB6) is also rather natural and automatically satisfied in the homogeneous case. We will show in Corollary 3.21 below that (TTB1), (TTB2), (TTB3), (TTB4) and (TTB6) together imply (TTB7), so we can drop the latter. Large parts of the theory, including our local-to-global theorem (Theorem 3.17 below), can be proved without reference to (TTB5) or (TTB6).

---

[1] We note Kramer formulates these axioms in terms of the simplicial complex approach to buildings; in view of the examples we have in mind, it appeared convenient to us to reformulate the theory in the language of chamber systems. A detailled discussion of the two approaches—the simplicial complex one and the chamber system one—can be found in [AB08]. Axiom (TTB7) ensures that in our approach one can reconstruct the topology on the set of chambers from the induced topologies on the sets of vertices and we will see in Corollary 3.21 that (TTB7) in fact is implied by (TTB1)–(TTB4) and (TTB6).

To summarize, the main difference between Kramer's definition and ours is that we demand the additional axiom (TTB3) to hold. (By connectedness of the chamber systems we could as well demand (TTB3+).) This is motivated by the following observation, which will be proved in Section 3.3 below:

Proposition 3.2. *Assume (Δ, τ) satisfies (TTB1), (TTB2) and (TTB4)-(TTB6). Fix $c_\pm \in \Delta_\pm$ and define a new topology τ' on Δ by*

$$\tau' := \{U \subset \Delta_+ \cup \Delta_- \mid U \cap (E_{\leq w}(c_+) \cup E_{\leq w}(c_-)) \in \tau|_{E_{\leq w}(c_+) \cup E_{\leq w}(c_-)}\}.$$

Then (Δ, τ') is a topological twin building.

Given a pair (Δ, τ) satisfying (TTB1), (TTB2) and (TTB4)–(TTB6), we refer to (Δ, τ') as in the proposition as the **Schubert completion** of (Δ, τ). Two twin buildings with the same Schubert completion have the same Schubert varieties, hence may only differ topologically at infinity. For purposes of classification it seems unnatural to distinguish between such twin building, and we thus will consider them equivalent. Since, by the proposition, every equivalence class has a (unique) representative satisfying (TTB3), we allow ourselves to make this axiom part of our definition of topological twin buildings.

Remark 3.3. It is common practice in homotopy theory to replace a topology by its compactly generated counterpart. Schubert completion provides a retopologization procedure which is similar in flavour. However, we should warn the reader that we do not know whether this procedure preserves the homotopy type. For example, our proof of the topological Solomon-Tits theorem relies crucially on (TTB3), and it is not clear to us whether this assumption can be dropped.

3.2 Point-set topology of topological twin buildings, I

In this section we investigate basic point-set topological properties of topological twin buildings. It turns out that the full strength of the axioms is not needed to establish these basic properties. Indeed, the results established in this section hold for every thick twin building $\Delta = ((\Delta_+, \delta_+), (\Delta_-, \delta_-), \delta^*)$, which is endowed with a topology satisfying axioms (TTB1), $\frac{1}{2}$(TTB2) and (TTB3). We will take advantage of this fact later on.

Lemma 3.4. *Let $c_\pm \in \Delta_\pm$ be opposite chambers and let $w \in W \setminus \{1\}$. Then there exists an open neighbourhood U of c_+ in Δ_+, which does not intersect $E^*_w(c_-)$.*

Proof. Fix a reduced expression $w = s_1 \cdots s_k$ with $s_j \in S$. By Lemma 2.11 there exists $d_- \in \Delta_-$ with $\delta^*(c_+, d_-) = 1$ and $\delta^*(x, d_-) = s_k$ for all $x \in E^*_w(c_-)$. For every $d' \in P_{s_k}(d_-) \setminus \{d_-, \mathrm{proj}^*_{P_{s_k}(d_-)}(c_+)\}$ we have

$$\{c_+\} \cup E^*_w(c_-) \subset E^*_1(d').$$

By $\frac{1}{2}$(TTB2) the restriction of $\mathrm{proj}^*_{P_{s_k}(d')}$ defines a continuous map

$$f : E^*_1(d') \to P_{s_k}(d') = P_{s_k}(d_-).$$

Therefore the lemma follows from the fact that $P_{s_k}(d')$ is Hausdorff (TTB1) and that $E^*_w(c_-) \subseteq f^{-1}(d_-)$. □

Proposition 3.5. *For every $c \in \Delta_\pm$ the co-Schubert cell $E^*_1(c)$ is open.*

Proof. By symmetry we may assume $c \in \Delta_-$. By (TTB3) it suffices to show that for $c_0 \in \Delta_+$ the set $E^*_1(c)$ is relatively open in $E_{\leq w}(c_0)$ for all $w \in W$, i.e., any $c_+ \in E_{\leq w}(c_0) \cap E^*_1(c)$ is an interior point. By Lemma 2.10 the function $\delta^*(\cdot, c)$ takes only finitely many values on $E_{\leq w}(c_0)$, and for each non-trivial value w_j Lemma 3.4 produces an open neighbourhood U_j of c_+ in Δ_+ with $U_j \cap E^*_{w_j}(c) = \emptyset$. Then $E_{\leq w}(c_0) \cap \bigcap U_j$ is an open subset of $E_{\leq w}(c_0)$ containing c_+ and contained in $E^*_1(c)$, i.e., c_+ is an interior point of $E_{\leq w}(c_0) \cap E^*_1(c)$. □

Given a panel $P \subset \Delta_\pm$ and a chamber $c \in P$ we denote by $P^\times = P_c^\times$ the **pointed panel** $P \setminus \{c\}$. A pointed panel is open in its ambient panel by (TTB1).

Proposition 3.6. *Let $P \subset \Delta_\pm$ and $Q \subset \Delta_\mp$ be opposite panels. Then the map $c \mapsto \mathrm{proj}^*_Q(c)$ restricts to a homeomorphism $p^*_{PQ} : P \to Q$.*

Proof. By [AB08, Proposition 5.152] the maps p^*_{PQ} and p^*_{QP} are mutually inverse bijections. Hence it remains only to establish their continuity. For this let $c \in P$ and $d := p^*_{PQ}(c) \in Q$ its projection. Then $P_c^\times \subset E_1^*(d)$, whence the restriction of p^*_{PQ} to $P_c^\times$ is continuous by $\frac{1}{2}$(TTB2). Since the open subsets $\{P_c^\times \mid c \in P\}$ cover P, this implies continuity of p^*_{PQ}. □

Combining this with Lemma 2.9 we obtain:

Corollary 3.7. *Panels of the same type are pairwise homeomorphic.*

We now define a functor type from the category of pointed topological twin buildings of a fixed type (W, S) to the category of topological spaces as follows: Given a topological twin building Δ we set

$$\mathrm{type}(\Delta, c) := \bigcup_{s \in S} P_s(c)$$

and refer to $\mathrm{type}(\Delta, c)$ as the **topological type** of the twin building Δ at c. Every based morphism φ of (pointed) topological twin buildings then induces a continuous map $\mathrm{type}(\varphi)$ between the corresponding topological types by restriction. Axiom ensures that, up to homeomorphism, $\mathrm{type}(\Delta, c)$ does not depend on the choice of basepoint c. We will see in Section 3.4 below that the topology of Δ is uniquely determined by its topological type.

As another application of Proposition 3.5 we show:

Proposition 3.8. *Every pair of opposite residues in Δ yields a twin building that endowed with the subspace topology satisfies axioms (TTB1), $\frac{1}{2}$(TTB2) and (TTB3). Furthermore, every pair of opposite residues of a topological twin building yields a topological twin building.*

The combinatorial part of the statement is well-known (see, e.g., [AB08, Exercise 5.166]) so that we concentrate on the topological part; this is a straightforward verification, except for (TTB3), where the following lemma is needed:

Lemma 3.9. *Let $J \subset S$. Then every J-residue in $\Delta_\pm$ is closed.*

Proof. We will prove that for a J-residue $R \subset \Delta_+$ the set $\Delta_+ \backslash R$ is open by showing that an arbitrary $c \in \Delta_+ \backslash R$ is an interior point. Let $d \in R$ so that $\delta_+(d, c) \notin \langle J \rangle$, let (Σ_+, Σ_-) be a twin apartment that contains both c and d, and denote by e the unique chamber in $\Sigma_- \cap E_1^*(c)$. For every $f \in R$ we have

$$\delta^*(f, e) \overset{2.10}{\in} \langle J \rangle \delta^*(d, e) \overset{2.7}{=} \langle J \rangle \delta_+(d, c) \delta^*(c, e) = \langle J \rangle \delta_+(d, c),$$

whence there exists $s \in S \backslash J$ with $\delta^*(f, e) \geq s$ for all $f \in R$. This shows $c \in E_1^*(e) \subset \Delta_+ \backslash R$, i.e., by Proposition 3.5 c is an interior point of $\Delta_+ \backslash R$. □

3.3 Gallery spaces and Bott–Samelson desingularizations

In this section we provide tools that will allow us to study the global point-set topology of topological twin buildings. We require the twin building topologies to satisfy axioms (TTB1), $\frac{1}{2}$(TTB2), (TTB3) and (TTB4).

For a reduced word $s_1 \cdots s_k \in W$ define a **gallery** of type $(s_1, \ldots, s_k)$ as a tuple $(c_0, \ldots, c_k) \in (\Delta_\pm)^{k+1}$ satisfying $c_i \in \mathrm{Pan}_{s_i}(c_{i-1})$ for $i = 1, \ldots, k$. The chamber $c_0 \in \Delta_\pm$ is called the **initial chamber** of the gallery. The set of all galleries of type $(s_1, \ldots, s_k)$ with initial chamber c_0 is denoted by $\mathrm{Gall}(s_1, \ldots, s_k; c_0)$; it is endowed with the subspace topology induced from $(\Delta_\pm)^{k+1}$.

The natural **projection** and **stammering maps** allow one to pass between different gallery spaces:

$$\begin{aligned}
\pi_{s_1,\ldots,s_k;c_0} : \mathrm{Gall}(s_1,\ldots,s_k;c_0) &\to \mathrm{Gall}(s_1,\ldots,s_{k-1};c_0)\\
(c_0,\ldots,c_k) &\mapsto (c_0,\ldots,c_{k-1}),\\
s_{s_1,\ldots,s_k;c_0} : \mathrm{Gall}(s_1,\ldots,s_{k-1};c_0) &\to \mathrm{Gall}(s_1,\ldots,s_k;c_0)\\
(c_0,\ldots,c_{k-1}) &\mapsto (c_0,\ldots,c_{k-1},c_{k-1}).
\end{aligned}$$

The following observation of Kramer provides a key insight into the topological structure of topological twin buildings. Recall from Corollary 3.7 that panels of the same type are pairwise homeomorphic.

Proposition 3.10 ([Kra02, p. 170, 171])**.** *For every $c_0 \in \Delta_\pm$ the gallery space $\mathrm{Gall}(s_1,\ldots,s_k;c_0)$ is a locally trivial fibre bundle over $\mathrm{Gall}(s_1,\ldots,s_{k-1};c_0)$ with fibre $P_{s_k}(c_0)$ via $\pi_{s_1,\ldots,s_k;c_0}$. The stammering map $s_{s_1,\ldots,s_k;c_0}$ defines a global section of this bundle.*

Proof. By symmetry we may assume $c_0 \in \Delta_+$. For each $e \in \Delta_-$ define

$$U_e := \{(c_0,\ldots,c_{k-1}) \in \mathrm{Gall}(s_1,\ldots,s_{k-1};c_0) \mid c_{k-1} \in E_1^*(e)\}.$$

By Proposition 3.5 the family $(U_e)_{e\in\Delta_-}$ provides an open covering of $\mathrm{Gall}(s_1,\ldots,s_{k-1};c_0)$. By Proposition 3.6, for each $e \in \Delta_-$ the map

$$\begin{aligned}
h_e : U_e \times P_{s_k}(e) &\to \pi^{-1}_{s_1,\ldots,s_k;c_0}(U_e)\\
(c_0,\ldots,c_{k-1},d) &\mapsto (c_0,\ldots,c_{k-1},\mathrm{proj}^*_{P_{s_k}(c_{k-1})}(d))
\end{aligned} \tag{3.1}$$

is a homeomorphism, which in view of Corollary 3.7 provides the desired local trivialization. The final claim is obvious. □

Remark 3.11. By (TTB4) and Corollary 3.7 panels are compact, thus so are the gallery spaces by Proposition 3.10. Hence for each reduced word $s_1 \cdots s_k$ the (surjective) endpoint map

$$\begin{aligned}
p_{s_1,\ldots,s_k;c_0} : \mathrm{Gall}(s_1,\ldots,s_k;c_0) &\to E_{\le s_1\cdots s_k}(c_0)\\
(c_0,\ldots,c_k) &\mapsto c_k
\end{aligned}$$

is a quotient map by (TTB1).

This remark implies:

Corollary 3.12. *Schubert varieties are compact.*

The corollary has important consequences for the point-set topology of topological twin buildings.

Definition 3.13. A Hausdorff topological space X is called a k_ω **space** if there exists a countable ascending sequence $K_1 \subseteq K_2 \subseteq \cdots \subseteq X$ of compact sets such that X is the direct limit of the K_n, i.e., $X = \bigcup_{n\in\mathbb{N}} K_n$ and such that $U \subseteq X$ is open if and only if $U \cap K_n$ is open in K_n for each n with respect to the subspace topology.

We refer the reader to [FT77] for an overview over the theory of k_ω spaces; the benefits of the theory of k_ω spaces for studying twin buildings and Kac–Moody groups are clearly visible in [GGH10]. Key properties of k_ω spaces for the present article are:

Proposition 3.14 ([FT77], [GGH10, Proposition 4.2])**.** *Each σ-compact locally compact Hausdorff space is k_ω. Moreover, the category of k_ω spaces is closed under taking closed subspaces, finite products, Hausdorff quotients and countable disjoint unions. Every k_ω space is paracompact, Lindelöf and normal.*

Corollary 3.15. *Each half of a twin building which is endowed with a topology that satisfies axioms (TTB1), $\frac{1}{2}$(TTB2), (TTB3) and (TTB4) is a k_ω space, in particular paracompact, Lindelöf and normal. It is compact if and only if it is spherical.*

Proof. The first statement follows from Proposition 3.14, Corollary 3.12 and (TTB3), whereas the second statement then follows from the fact that a closed subset of a direct limit of compact spaces is compact if and only if it is already contained in one of the compact spaces. ☐

Note that the corollary is based on the interplay of axioms (TTB3) and (TTB4). Another example for this interplay is provided by the following proposition, which we record for later use:

Proposition 3.16. *Let Δ be a twin building endowed with a topology that satisfies axioms (TTB1), $\frac{1}{2}$(TTB2), (TTB3) and (TTB4) such that panels are discrete. Then Δ itself is discrete.*

Proof. By assumption all panels are discrete and compact, hence finite. Consequently, Schubert varieties are finite and Hausdorff, hence discrete. Therefore the proposition follows from (TTB3). ☐

We can now carry out the proof of Proposition 3.2:

Proof of Proposition 3.2. Firstly, τ' refines τ, whence (Δ, τ') inherits (TTB1) and (TTB5) from (Δ, τ). Also (TTB3) holds by definition. As for (TTB4), assume $P \in \mathrm{Pan}_s(\Delta_\pm)$ is compact with respect to τ. Let $\{U_\alpha\} \subset \tau'|_P$ be a covering of P and choose w so large that $P \subset E_{\leq w}(c_\pm)$. Then $\{U_\alpha\} = \{U_\alpha \cap E_{\leq w}(c_\pm)\} \subset \tau|_P$, hence their exists a finite subcovering, showing that $(P, \tau'|_P)$ is also compact.

We now claim that $\frac{1}{2}$(TTB2) holds. For this, fix $s \in S$ and $c \in \Delta_+ \cup \Delta_-$. Then the map $\varphi_{s,c} : E_1^*(c) \to \Delta_+ \cup \Delta_-$ given by $d \mapsto \mathrm{proj}^*_{P_s(c)}(d)$ takes values in $P_s(c)$, and given base chambers $c_\pm \in \Delta_\pm$ we can choose $w \in W$ so that $P_s(c) \subset E := E_{\leq w}(c_+) \cup E_{\leq w}(c_-)$. We then obtain for all $A \subset \Delta_+ \cup \Delta_-$,

$$\varphi_{s,c}^{-1}(A) = \varphi_{s,c}^{-1}(A \cap E). \tag{3.2}$$

Now if $U \in \tau'$, then by definition there exists $V \in \tau$ such that $U \cap E = V \cap E$. Since $\varphi_{s,c}$ is τ-continuous we then deduce from (3.2) that

$$\varphi_{s,c}^{-1}(U) = \varphi_{s,c}^{-1}(U \cap E) = \varphi_{s,c}^{-1}(V \cap E) = \varphi_{s,c}^{-1}(V) \in \tau \subset \tau',$$

which shows τ'-continuity of $\varphi_{s,c}$ and thereby establishes $\frac{1}{2}$(TTB2).

At this point we know that τ' satisfies (TTB1), $\frac{1}{2}$(TTB2) and (TTB3–5). This is sufficient to be able to apply Corollary 3.12 and to deduce that Schubert varieties are compact in (Δ, τ'). It then follows that (Δ, τ') is a k_ω-space and the direct limit of the Schubert varieties in the category of k_ω-spaces. The latter implies that a closed subset $K \subset (\Delta, \tau')$ is compact if and only if it is contained in some Schubert variety. In particular, if we abbreviate $X := \Delta_+ \cup \Delta_-$ and choose basepoints $c_\pm \in \Delta_\pm$, then the subsets

$$X_n := \bigcup_{l(w) \leq n} (E_{\leq w}(c_+) \cup E_{\leq w}(c_-)) \subset X,$$

are compact and $X = \lim_\rightarrow X_n$. We use this to show (TTB2): Consider Δ_1 as a subset of $X \times X$ and observe that $X \times X = \lim_\rightarrow (X_n \times X_n)$ by [GGH10, Proposition 4.7]. Since Δ_1 is open in the product, it is locally k_ω ([GGH10, Proposition 4.2]) and [GGH10, Lemma 1.1] implies

$$(\Delta_1, (\tau' \times \tau')|_{\Delta_1}) = \lim_{\rightarrow} (\Delta_1 \cap (X_n \times X_n), (\tau \times \tau)|_{\Delta_1 \cap (X_n \times X_n)}).$$

Now the key observation is that

$$p_s(\Delta_1 \cap (X_n \times X_n)) \subset X_{n+1}.$$

Therefore the restriction $p_s|_{\Delta_1 \cap (X_n \times X_n)}$ factors as

$$p_s : \Delta_1 \cap (X_n \times X_n) \to X_{n+1} \hookrightarrow (X, \tau'),$$

which is evidently continuous. Passing to the limit yields continuity of p_s with respect to τ'.

Finally, we establish (TTB6) for (Δ, τ'). For this we first observe that (TTB6) is equivalent to the following statement: Whenever $U \in \tau$, then

$$U_s := \{c \in \Delta^\pm \mid \exists d \in \Delta^\pm : c \in R_{S \setminus \{s\}}(d)\} \in \tau,$$

We now deduce the same property for τ'. If $U \in \tau'$, say $U \subset \Delta_+$, then for every $w \in W$ there exists $U_w \in \tau$ such that

$$U \cap E_{\leq w}(c_+) = U_w \cap E_{\leq w}(c_+).$$

By assumption we have $(U_w)_s \in \tau$. Now,

$$U_s \cap E_{\leq w}(c_+) = (U_w)_s \cap E_{\leq w}(c_+) \in \tau|_{E_{\leq w}(c_+)},$$

hence $U_s \in \tau'$. □

3.4 A local-to-global principle

Using the tools developed in the preceding section we derive a local-to-global principle for topological twin buildings. As in the last section it suffices to assume that the topology satisfies the axioms (TTB1), $\frac{1}{2}$(TTB2), (TTB3) and (TTB4). Recall that the type functor associates with every morphism of topological twin buildings a continuous map between the topological types. We now aim to show that this property characterizes morphisms of topological twin buildings among all twin building morphisms. More precisely, let $\Delta^{(1)}, \Delta^{(2)}$ be topological twin buildings and let $\varphi : \Delta^{(1)} \to \Delta^{(2)}$ be a morphism of the underlying abstract twin buildings. Choose $c_+^{(1)} \in \Delta_+^{(1)}$; then the map

$$\text{type}_{c_+^{(1)}}(\varphi) : \bigcup_{s \in S} P_s(c_+^{(1)}) \to \bigcup_{s \in S} P_s(\varphi(c_+^{(1)}))$$

between the topological types of the $\Delta^{(j)}$ can still be defined, but need not be continuous. Now we have:

Theorem 3.17 (Local-to-global for twin building topologies)**.** *Let $\Delta^{(1)}, \Delta^{(2)}$ be twin buildings endowed with topologies that each satisfies axioms (TTB1), $\frac{1}{2}$(TTB2), (TTB3) and (TTB4) and let $\varphi : \Delta^{(1)} \to \Delta^{(2)}$ be a morphism of the underlying twin buildings. Then φ is continuous if and only if* type(φ) *is continuous.*

In the spherical case the above local-to-global result was first proved in [BK95, Proposition 3.5] using a coordinatization procedure which, however, is not available in the general case. (Observe that the coordinatization given in [Kra02] provides coordinates on Schubert cells rather than co-Schubert cells.)

Proof. Assume that type(φ) is continuous. Since φ is a morphism, for arbitrary opposite panels P and Q of $\Delta^{(1)}$ one has

$$\varphi \circ p^*_{PQ} = p^*_{\varphi(P)\varphi(Q)} \circ \varphi,$$

where $p^*_{PQ} : P \to Q$ and $p^*_{\varphi(P)\varphi(Q)} : \varphi(P) \to \varphi(Q)$ are the projection homeomorphisms from Proposition 3.6. By Lemma 2.9 and the continuity of type(φ) this implies that for each panel P of $\Delta^{(1)}$ the restriction $\varphi_{|P}$ is continuous.

For an arbitrary reduced word $s_1 \cdots s_k \in W$ and any chamber $c \in \Delta^{(1)}_\pm$ the morphism φ induces a map

$$\varphi_{s_1,\ldots,s_k;c} : \text{Gall}(s_1, \ldots, s_k; c) \to \text{Gall}(s_1, \ldots, s_k; \varphi(c)).$$

We will prove by induction on k that $\varphi_{s_1,\ldots,s_k;c}$ is continuous. For $k = 0$ there is nothing to show, so we immediately turn to the case $k > 0$. Then by Proposition 3.5 the sets

$$U_e := \{(c, c_1 \ldots, c_{k-1}) \in \mathrm{Gall}(s_1, \ldots, s_{k-1}; c) \,|\, c_{k-1} \in E_1^*(e)\}$$

provide an open covering of $\mathrm{Gall}(s_1, \ldots, s_{k-1}; \varphi(c))$ (cf. the proof of Proposition 3.10). The homeomorphisms h_e and $h_{\varphi(e)}$ from (3.1) yield a commuting diagram

$$\begin{tikzcd}
U_e \times P_{s_k}(e) \arrow[r, "h_e"] \arrow[d, "\left(\varphi_{|U_e}, \varphi_{|P_{s_k}(e)}\right)"'] & \pi^{-1}_{s_1,\ldots,s_k;c}(U_e) \arrow[d, "\varphi_{|\pi^{-1}_{s_1,\ldots,s_k;c}(U_e)}"] \\
U_{\varphi(e)} \times P_{s_k}(\varphi(e)) \arrow[r, "h_{\varphi(e)}"] & \pi^{-1}_{s_1,\ldots,s_k;\varphi(c)}(U_\varphi(e)).
\end{tikzcd}$$

The left vertical arrow is continuous, because $\varphi_{|U_e}$ is continuous by the induction hypothesis and $\varphi_{|P_{s_k}(e)}$ is continuous by the above argument. Therefore also the right vertical arrow is continuous. As the sets $\pi^{-1}_{s_1,\ldots,s_k;c}(U_e)$ form an open covering of $\mathrm{Gall}(s_1, \ldots, s_k; c)$, this implies continuity of the map $\varphi_{s_1,\ldots,s_k;c}$.

By Remark 3.11 the endpoint map $p_{s_1,\ldots,s_k;c} : \mathrm{Gall}(s_1, \ldots, s_k; c) \to E_{\leq s_1 \cdots s_k}(c)$ is a quotient map, so that $\varphi_{|E_{\leq s_1 \cdots s_k}}(c)$ is continuous.

Therefore φ is continuous by (TTB3). □

Corollary 3.18. *Let Δ be a twin building endowed with a topology that satisfies axioms (TTB1), $\frac{1}{2}$(TTB2), (TTB3) and (TTB4) and let φ be an automorphism of the underlying twin building. If, for each type $s \in S$, there exists a panel P_s of type s such that $\varphi_{|P_s}$ is continuous, then φ is a homeomorphism.*

Proof. Continuity of φ is immediate by Theorem 3.17. By axioms (TTB1) and (TTB4) and Corollary 3.7, each $\varphi_{|P_s} : P_s \to \varphi(P_s)$ is a bijective quotient map, i.e., open. Hence also continuity of φ^{-1} follows from Theorem 3.17, and φ is a homeomorphism. □

3.5 Point-set topology of topological twin buildings, II

The k_ω property established in Corollary 3.15 has many implications concerning the point-set topology of twin buildings some of which we collect below. To obtain the strongest conclusions we will need all the axioms except for (TTB5). Thus we assume from now on that $\Delta = ((\Delta_+, \delta_+), (\Delta_-, \delta_-), \delta^*)$ is a twin building endowed with a topology which satisfies axioms (TTB1), $\frac{1}{2}$(TTB2), (TTB3), (TTB4), (TTB6).

For a subset $J \subset S$ equip the set $\mathrm{Res}_J(\Delta_\pm)$ of J-residues in $\Delta_\pm$ with the quotient topology with respect to the map $\Delta_\pm \to \mathrm{Res}_J(\Delta_\pm)$; cf. Lemma 2.3.

We observe:

Lemma 3.19. *The quotient maps $\Delta_\pm \to \mathrm{Res}_J(\Delta_\pm)$ are open.*

Proof. This is an immediate consequence of (TTB6). □

From this we deduce:

Proposition 3.20. *For each $J \subset S$ the space $\mathrm{Res}_J(\Delta_\pm)$ is k_ω. In particular, for each $s \in S$ the spaces $\mathrm{Pan}_s(\Delta_\pm)$ and $\mathcal{V}_s^\pm$ are k_ω.*

Proof. In view of Proposition 3.14 and its Corollary 3.15 it suffices to show that each $\mathrm{Res}_J(\Delta_\pm)$ is Hausdorff. Thus let R_1, R_2 be distinct J-residues in $\Delta_\pm$. Since $\Delta_\pm$ ist normal (Proposition 3.14) and R_1, R_2 are closed (Lemma 3.9), there exist open neighbourhoods separating them. Hence the claim follows from Lemma 3.19. □

This in turn implies:

Corollary 3.21. *The diagonal embedding*

$$\begin{array}{rcl} \iota : \Delta_\pm & \hookrightarrow & \prod_{s\in S} \mathcal{V}_s^\pm \\ c & \mapsto & \left(R_{S\backslash\{s\}}(c)\right)_{s\in S} \end{array}$$

is a homeomorphism onto its image, i.e., the topology of the twin building is induced by the topologies of the vertex sets.

As mentioned earlier, this corollary yields the compatibility of our approach to topological twin buildings with the one by Kramer [Kra02, p. 169].

Proof. The map ι is continuous by definition of the quotient topology, and hence the restriction to any Schubert variety $E_{\leq w}(c^\pm) \subset \Delta_\pm$ is a homeomorphism onto its image by compactness (Corollary 3.12), as the $\mathcal{V}_s^\pm$ are Hausdorff (Proposition 3.20).

As finite products and direct limits commute in the category of k_ω spaces (cf. [Glö03, Proposition 3.3], [GGH10, Proposition 4.7]), the image of ι is the direct limit of the images of the Schubert varieties, and so the claim follows. □

Remark 3.22. By a similar argument one cannot only identify vertices, but also residues of any fixed type with the corresponding collections of chambers.

3.6 Algebraic operations

By [GKK95, Proposition 1.1] punctured panels in a generalized polygon carry a multiplication operation, which can be defined in elementary geometric terms, i.e. by intersecting lines and connecting points. The following proposition provides an extension to the twin building case:

Proposition 3.23. *Let (Δ, τ) be a topological twin building, let $c_\pm$ be opposite chambers, let $r, s \in S$ with $3 \leq m_{rs} \leq \infty$, let $0_+ := \mathrm{proj}^*_{P_r(c_+)}(c_-)$ and $0_- := \mathrm{proj}^*_{P_s(c_-)}(c_+)$, and let $P_r(c_+)^\times := P_r(c_+)\backslash\{c_+\}$ and $P_s(c_-)^\times := P_s(c_-)\backslash\{c_-\}$.*

For each choice $1_- \in P_s(c_-)^\times\backslash\{0_-\}$, there exists a continuous map

$$\bullet : P_r(c_+)^\times \times P_s(c_-)^\times \to P_r(c_+)^\times$$

with the following properties:

- *(i) For all $c \in \Delta^+$ we have $c \bullet 0_- = 0_+$ and $c \bullet 1_- = c$.*
- *(ii) For every $c' \in P_s(c_-)^\times \setminus \{0_-\}$ the map $c \mapsto c \bullet c'$ is a homeomorphism of $P_r(c_+)^\times$.*

The proof of Proposition 3.23 is based on the following lemma; this is one of the two places where we actually make use of (TTB5). We remark that in the two-spherical case one can prove Proposition 3.23 without recurrence to (TTB5); indeed, one immediately reduces to the case of compact polygons, where the proof can be found in [Kra94].

Lemma 3.24. *For every $s \in S$ the map*

$$\begin{array}{rcl} \Delta_{\langle s\rangle} & \to & \Delta_+ \cup \Delta_- \\ \{P, c\} & \mapsto & \mathrm{proj}^*_P(c) \end{array}$$

is continuous, where $\Delta_{\langle s\rangle} := \{(P,c) \in \mathrm{Pan}_s(\Delta_+)\times\Delta_- \mid \delta^*(P,c) \in \langle s\rangle\}\cup\{(c,P) \in \Delta_+\times\mathrm{Pan}_s(\Delta_-) \mid \delta^*(c,P) \in \langle s\rangle\}$.

Proof. The quotient map $(\Delta_+ \times \Delta_-) \cup (\Delta_- \times \Delta_+) \to (\mathrm{Pan}_s(\Delta_+) \times \Delta_-) \cup (\Delta_+ \times \mathrm{Pan}_s(\Delta_-))$ is open by Lemma 3.19, and so is its restriction $\Delta_1 \to \Delta_{\langle s\rangle}$ to the open subset Δ_1 by (TTB5). By (Tw3) this restricted map is surjective, so the claim follows from (TTB2). □

Proof of Proposition 3.23. Note that $P_r(1_-)$ is opposite $P_r(c_+)$. For $d_+ := \mathrm{proj}^*_{P_s(c_+)}(c_-)$, the panel $P_r(d_+)$ is opposite $P_r(1_-)$, because $1_- \neq c_- = \mathrm{proj}^*_{P_s(c_-)}(d_+)$, i.e., 1_- is opposite d_+. Define

$$\begin{array}{rcl} g : P_r(c_+)^\times \times P_s(c_-)^\times & \to & \Delta_- \\ (x,y) & \mapsto & \mathrm{proj}^*_{P_r(y)} \circ \mathrm{proj}^*_{P_r(d_+)} \circ \mathrm{proj}^*_{P_r(1_-)}(x), \\ \bullet : P_r(c_+)^\times \times P_s(c_-)^\times & \to & P_r(c_+)^\times \\ (x,y) & \mapsto & \mathrm{proj}^*_{P_r(c_+)} \circ \mathrm{proj}^*_{P_r(y)} \circ \mathrm{proj}^*_{P_r(d_+)} \circ \mathrm{proj}^*_{P_r(1_-)}(x) \\ & = & \mathrm{proj}^*_{P_r(c_+)}(g(x,y)). \end{array}$$

Note that the fact $x \bullet y \in P_r(c_+)^\times$ requires a proof that we will provide below.

As $P_r(d_+)$ is indeed opposite to $P_r(y)$ for all $y \in P_s(c_-)^\times = P_s(c_-)\backslash\{\mathrm{proj}^*_{P_s(c_-)}(d_+)\}$, by Proposition 3.6 and Lemma 2.8 the map $g(\cdot, y) : P_r(c_+)^\times \to P_r(y)\backslash\{\mathrm{proj}^*_{P_r(y)}(d_+)\}$ is a homeomorphism for every $y \in P_s(c_-)^\times$.

The codistances between elements of $P_r(0_-)$ and of $P_r(c_+)$ lie in the set $\{s, rs, sr, rsr\}$. Since $rsr \neq s$, the panels $P_r(0_-)$ and $P_r(c_+)$ are not parallel and, thus, the chamber $x \bullet 0_- \in P_r(c_+)$ is independent of x. In fact, $x \bullet 0_-$ equals the unique element in $P_r(c_+)$ for which there exists a chamber in $P_r(0_-)$ at codistance rsr, i.e., $x \bullet 0_- = 0_+ \in P_r(c_+)^\times$ for all $x \in P_r(c_+)^\times$.

For $y \in P_s(c_-)^\times\backslash\{0_-\}$ the panels $P_r(y)$ and $P_r(c_+)$ are parallel, and so Lemma 2.8 implies $\mathrm{proj}^*_{P_r(c_+)} \circ \mathrm{proj}^*_{P_r(y)} \circ \mathrm{proj}^*_{P_r(d_+)} \circ \mathrm{proj}^*_{P_r(1_-)}(c_+) = \mathrm{proj}^*_{P_r(c_+)} \circ \mathrm{proj}^*_{P_r(y)}(d_+) = c_+$. We conclude that for $x \in P_r(c_+)^\times$ indeed $x \bullet y \in P_r(c_+)^\times$ and that $P_r(c_+)^\times \to P_r(c_+)^\times : x \mapsto x \bullet y$ is a homeomorphism.

We compute $g(x, 1_-) = \mathrm{proj}^*_{P_r(1_-)} \circ \mathrm{proj}^*_{P_r(d_+)} \circ \mathrm{proj}^*_{P_r(1_-)}(x) = \mathrm{proj}^*_{P_r(1_-)}(x)$, whence $x \bullet 1_- = \mathrm{proj}^*_{P_r(c_+)} \circ \mathrm{proj}^*_{P_r(1_-)}(x) = x$.

It remains to prove continuity of $\bullet$. Continuity of g follows immediately from (TTB2) and Lemma 3.24. It thus remains to show that $\mathrm{proj}^*_{P_r(c_+)}$ is continuous on $G := g(P_r(c_+)^\times \times P_s(c_-)^\times)$. To this end we claim that the following hold:

(†) $\delta^*(c^+, G) = \{1, r, s\}$;

(††) $e \in G \cap E_1^*(d_+) \Rightarrow \mathrm{proj}^*_{P_r(c_+)}(e) = \mathrm{proj}^*_{P_r(c_+)}(\mathrm{proj}^*_{P_{s_j}(e)}(d_+))$.

Let us first show that these claims imply the proposition: By (†) the sets U_1, U_2 given by

$$U_1 := G \cap (E_1^*(c_+) \cup E_1^*(0_+)), \quad U_2 := G \cap E_1^*(d_+)$$

form an open covering of G. It is immediate from (TTB2) that $\mathrm{proj}^*_{P_r(c_+)}$ is continuous on U_1 and the map $e \mapsto \mathrm{proj}^*_{P_r(c_+)}(\mathrm{proj}^*_{P_{s_j}(e)}(d_+))$ is continuous on U_2. Thus continuity of $\mathrm{proj}^*_{P_r(c_+)}$ on all of G follows from (††), and we are left with verifying our claims. As far as (†) is concerned, let $(x, y) \in P_r(c_+)^\times \times P_s(c_-)^\times$ and assume $y \neq 0_-$. Since $\delta^*(c_+, y) = 1$ and $\delta(y, g(x, y)) \in \langle r \rangle$ it then follows that $\delta^*(c_+, g(x, y)) \in \langle r \rangle$. On the other hand, if $y = 0_-$, then

$$\mathrm{proj}^*_{P_r(c_+)}(g(x,y)) = x \bullet y = 0_+,$$

whence $g(x, y) = \mathrm{proj}^*_{P_r(0_-)}(0_+)$ and $\delta^*(c_+, g(x, y)) = s$. To prove (††) we fix $e \in U_2$ and abbreviate $a := \mathrm{proj}^*_{P_s(e)}(d_+)$. Since $\delta^*(b, c_+) \in \langle s \rangle$, we see that $b := \mathrm{proj}^*_{P_r(c_+)}(e)$ is the unique element in $P_r(c_+)$ satisfying $\delta^*(b, e) \in r\langle s \rangle$. On the other hand we had assumed $\delta^*(d_+, e) = 1$, which implies $\delta^*(d_+, a) = s_j$. This in turn implies $\delta^*(c_+, a) = 1$, hence $\delta^*(\mathrm{proj}^*_{P_r(c_+)}(a), a) = r$ and finally $\delta^*(\mathrm{proj}^*_{P_r(c_+)}(a), e) \in r\langle s \rangle$, showing $\mathrm{proj}^*_{P_r(c_+)}(a) = b$ and finishing the proof. □

4 Topological RGD systems and topological twin buildings

Throughout this section let G be a topological group with RGD system $(\{U_\alpha\}_{\alpha\in\Phi}, T)$ and denote by $\Delta = \Delta(G, \{U_\alpha\}_{\alpha\in\Phi}, T)$ the associated twin building. We equip both halves $\Delta_\pm$ of Δ with the quotient topology. The goal of this section is to find conditions on the topology of G which guarantee that Δ is a topological twin building.

4.1 Orbit closure relations

We will first be concerned with conditions which guarantee openness of the big cell. The quotient map $G \to G/B_\pm$ allows one to relate the big cell $B_\mp B_\pm$ in the building to the big cell $B_\mp B_\pm$ in the group: $B_\mp B_\pm$ considered as a subset of G is open if and only if $B_\mp B_\pm$ is open considered as a subset of $\Delta_\pm$. We conclude that for questions concerning the openness (and closedness) of unions of $B_\mp$-$B_\pm$-double cosets it is in fact irrelevant whether one uses the group or the building topology. Our first important reduction step will establish the following result:

Lemma 4.1. *Let G, Δ, $B_\pm$ as above. If Δ satisfies axioms (TTB1), $\frac{1}{2}$(TTB2) and (TTB3), then B_+B_- and B_-B_+ are open in G.*

If Δ has discrete panels, then Δ itself is discrete by Proposition 3.16, and the lemma holds trivially. We will thus assume from now on that Δ is a twin building with non-discrete panels, satisfying axioms (TTB1), $\frac{1}{2}$(TTB2) and (TTB3). Under this assumption we will provide a more precise result: We will compute the closures of arbitrary B_--B_+ double cosets. We begin with the following observation:

Proposition 4.2. *Let $c_\mp \in \Delta_\mp$, $d \in \Delta_\pm$, let $\delta^*(c_\mp, d) = w$, let $B_\mp$ be the Borel subgroup associated to $c_\mp$, let $B_\pm$ be a Borel subgroup opposite $B_\mp$, and let $v \in W$ such that $w \not\geq v$ in the Bruhat order. Then there exists an open neighbourhood of d in $\Delta_\pm$ disjoint from $B_\mp v B_\pm$.*

Proof. Let Σ be a twin apartment containing d and $c_\mp$ and let $\tilde{w}^{-1} \in \mathrm{Stab}_{G_{\mathcal{D}}(\mathbb{F})}(\Sigma)$ be a representative of w^{-1} that maps d to the chamber in Σ opposite $c_\mp$. Any chamber $x \in B_\mp v B_\pm$ of $\Delta_\pm$ satisfies $\delta^*(c_\mp, x) = v$, so $\delta^*(\tilde{w}^{-1}.c_\mp, \tilde{w}^{-1}.x) = v$. As $\delta_\mp(c_\mp, \tilde{w}^{-1}.c_\mp) = w^{-1}$, Lemma 2.10 allows us to conclude

$$\delta^*(c_\mp, \tilde{w}^{-1}.x) \in \{w_1 v \mid w_1 \text{ is a subexpression of } w^{-1}\}.$$

Hence, for $X := \tilde{w}^{-1} B_\mp v B_\pm$, the hypothesis $w \not\geq v$ yields $1_W \notin \delta^*(c_\mp, X)$. Therefore, for each $a \in \delta^*(c_\mp, X)$, Lemma 3.4 provides an open neighbourhood U_a of $\tilde{w}^{-1}.d$ which intersects $E^*_a(c_\mp)$ trivially. As $\delta^*(c_\mp, X)$ is finite, the set

$$U := \bigcap_{a \in \delta^*(c_\mp, X)} U_a,$$

is an open neighbourhood of $\tilde{w}^{-1}.d$. Since $X \subseteq \bigcup_{a \in \delta^*(c_\mp, X)} E^*_a(c_\mp)$, moreover $X \cap U = \emptyset$. Hence $\tilde{w}.U$ is an open neighbourhood of d satisfying $B_\mp v B_\pm \cap \tilde{w}.U = \emptyset$, as claimed. □

Lemma 4.3. *Let $w \in W$, let $s \in S$, and assume that the panels of Δ are non-discrete.*

(i) *If $l(ws) > l(w)$, then the following inclusions hold:*

  (a) $\overline{B_- w B_+} \supseteq B_- ws B_+$,

  (b) $\overline{B_+ w B_-} \supseteq B_+ ws B_-$.

(ii) *If $l(sw) > l(w)$, then the following inclusions hold:*

  (a) $\overline{B_- w B_+} \supseteq B_- sw B_+$,

  (b) $\overline{B_+ w B_-} \supseteq B_+ sw B_-$.

Proof. (i) Let $\varepsilon \in \{+, -\}$. By Lemma 2.16 the orbits of $B_{-\varepsilon}$ on Δ_ε are given by the $B_{-\varepsilon}$-B_ε-double cosets $B_{-\varepsilon} w B_\varepsilon$, $w \in W$. Let $c_{-\varepsilon}$ be the fundamental chamber in $\Delta_{-\varepsilon}$ and let $c \in \Delta_\varepsilon$ such that that $\delta^*(c_{-\varepsilon}, c) = w$, i.e., c is a representative of the $B_{-\varepsilon}$-orbit $B_{-\varepsilon} w B_\varepsilon$ in Δ_ε. Let $s \in S$ such that $l(ws) > l(w)$ and consider the s-panel $P_s(c)$ around c. The projection $d := \mathrm{proj}_{P_s(c)}(c_{-\varepsilon})$ is the unique chamber of $P_s(c)$ satisfying $\delta^*(c_{-\varepsilon}, d) = ws$ and the group $\mathrm{Stab}_{B_{-\varepsilon}}(P_s(c))$ acts transitively on the set $P_s(c) \backslash \{d\}$ of chambers distinct from d. Since $P_s(c)$ is non-discrete, it follows that d is contained in $\overline{P_s(c) \backslash \{d\}}$ and, thus, in $\overline{B_{-\varepsilon} w B_\varepsilon}$.

We conclude that, for each $s \in S$ such that $l(ws) > l(w)$, the closure of B_-wB_+ intersects the orbit $B_{-\varepsilon}wsB_\varepsilon$. Since this closure is a union of orbits, one has for all $s \in S$ with $l(ws) > l(w)$

$$\overline{B_{-\varepsilon}wB_\varepsilon} \supseteq B_{-\varepsilon}wsB_\varepsilon.$$

(ii) As inversion in G is a homeomorphism, one has $\overline{B_{-\varepsilon}wB_\varepsilon} \supseteq B_{-\varepsilon}swB_\varepsilon$ if and only if $\overline{B_\varepsilon w^{-1}B_{-\varepsilon}} \supseteq B_\varepsilon w^{-1}sB_{-\varepsilon}$. Hence the inequality $l(w^{-1}s) = l(w^{-1}s^{-1}) = l(sw) > l(w) = l(w^{-1})$ allows one to immediately conclude (ii) from (i). □

Now we can establish the following theorem, which contains Lemma 4.1 as a special case:

Theorem 4.4. *Let G be a topological group with RGD system $(\{U_\alpha\}_{\alpha\in\Phi}, T)$, let $\Delta = \Delta(G, \{U_\alpha\}_{\alpha\in\Phi}, T)$ be the associated twin building, equip both halves $\Delta_\pm$ of Δ with the quotient topology, and assume that this twin building topology satisfies axioms (TTB1), $\frac{1}{2}$(TTB2) and (TTB3) and that panels of Δ are non-discrete. Let W be its Weyl group, let $\leq$ the Bruhat order of W, and let $w \in W$. Then the following hold:*

(i)

$$\overline{B_-wB_+} = \bigsqcup_{w' \geq w} B_-w'B_+.$$

(ii) *The smallest open union of B_--B_+-double cosets containing B_-wB_+ is*

$$\bigsqcup_{w' \leq w} B_-w'B_+,$$

which consists of finitely many B_--B_+-double cosets.

Proof. (i) An induction using Lemma 4.3 shows that

$$\overline{B_-wB_+} \supseteq \bigsqcup_{w' \geq w} B_-w'B_+.$$

Conversely, let x be an element of the complement

$$X := \bigsqcup_{w' \ngeq w} B_-w'B_+$$

of $\bigsqcup_{w' \geq w} B_-w'B_+$. We will show that x lies in the interior of X. Let $n \in \mathbb{N}$ be sufficiently large such that $x \in \bigcup_{l(v)\leq n} B_+vB_+$. The intersection $\left(\bigsqcup_{w' \geq w} B_-w'B_+\right) \cap \left(\bigcup_{l(v)\leq n} B_+vB_+\right)$ meets finitely many B_--B_+-double cosets. Let $A \subset W$ be a finite set such that these double cosets are given by the family $\{B_-aB_+\}_{a\in A}$. For every $a \in A$, Proposition 4.2 provides an open neighbourhood U_a of x in G disjoint from B_-aB_+.

Then $\bigcap_{a\in A} U_a \cap \left(\bigcup_{l(v)\leq n} B_+vB_+\right)$ is open in $\bigcup_{l(v)\leq n} B_+vB_+$, contains x and intersects $\bigsqcup_{w' \geq w} B_-w'B_+$ trivially. Thus, this intersection is an open neighbourhood of x in $X \cap \left(\bigcup_{l(v)\leq n} B_+vB_+\right)$, and hence x is an interior point of $X \cap \left(\bigcup_{l(v)\leq n} B_+vB_+\right)$. As x was arbitrary, we conclude that $X \cap \left(\bigcup_{l(v)\leq n} B_+vB_+\right)$ is open in $\bigcup_{l(v)\leq n} B_+vB_+$ for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$. By axiom (TTB3) $\Delta_+ = \lim_\to \bigcup_{l(v)\leq n} B_+vB_+$, and so X is open in Δ_+ and, thus, in G.

(ii) Define the finite set $X_w := \{v \in W \mid v \nleq w, \exists s \in S \text{ such that } sv \leq w \text{ or } vs \leq w\}$. Then, for any $w' \in W$, one has $w' \nleq w$ if and only if there exists $v \in X_w$ such that $v \leq w'$. Hence, by (i),

$$\bigsqcup_{w' \leq w} B_-w'B_+ = G \setminus \bigcup_{x\in X} \overline{B_-xB_+}.$$

Since $\bigcup_{x\in X}\overline{B_-xB_+}$ is a finite union of closed sets, it is closed, and so its complement, $\bigsqcup_{w'\leq w} B_-w'B_+$, is open.

Moreover, if U is an arbitrary open union of B_--B_+-double cosets containing B_-wB_+, then by (i) for each $w'\leq w$ one necessarily has $B_-w'B_+\subseteq U$. $\square$

Remark 4.5. Theorem 4.4 is essentially [KP83b, Lemma 3.4]. A special case is [Ste68, Theorem 23 (p. 127)].

Remark 4.6. Theorem 4.4 states that there exists a closed B_--B_+-double coset if and only if there exists a maximal element of W with respect to the Bruhat order. This is the case if and only if W is spherical.

4.2 A group-theoretic criterion for twin building topologies

As before, let G be a topological group with RGD system $(\{U_\alpha\}_{\alpha\in\Phi},T)$ and denote by Δ the associated twin building. Our explicit projection formulas (Theorem 2.20) immediately yield the following proposition:

Proposition 4.7. *If the bijective product map* $m\colon U_+\times T\times U_-\to B_+B_-$ *is open, then* Δ *satisfies* $\frac{1}{2}$*(TTB2). If, moreover,* B_+B_- *is open in* G*, then* Δ *also satisfies (TTB2) and (TTB5).*

Proof. The set of pairs of chambers in $G/B_+\times G/B_-$ at codistance $1\in W$ is equal to $\{(gB_+,hB_-)\mid g^{-1}h\in B_+B_-\}$. Given $s\in S$, Theorem 2.20 implies $\operatorname{proj}^*_{P_s(hB_-)}(gB_+)=h\rho_w(g^{-1}h)^{-1}sB_-$. By Lemma 2.22 therefore Δ satisfies $\frac{1}{2}$(TTB2).

If B_+B_- is open in G, then (TTB5) holds by the discussion earlier in this section. We also note that $B_-B_+=(B_+B_-)^{-1}$ is open. Since $\Delta_\mp$ is endowed with the quotient topology and $B_\pm B_\mp$ is a saturated set, the set $B_\pm B_\mp\subset\Delta_\mp$ of chambers opposite the chamber $c_\pm:=B_\pm\in G/B_\pm$ is open in Δ. Since G acts on Δ by homeomorphisms with the orbits Δ_+ and Δ_-, we conclude that for each chamber c of Δ the set $E_1^*(c)$ of chambers opposite c is an open subset of Δ. Therefore $\bigcup_{c\in\Delta_+\cup\Delta_-}E_1^*(c)$ is an open cover of Δ_1. Hence, in order to show (TTB2), i.e., continuity of the map $p_s:\Delta_1\to\Delta_+\cup\Delta_-:(c,d)\mapsto\operatorname{proj}^*_{P_s(c)}(d)$ for each $s\in S$, it suffices to observe continuity of $p_{s|E_1^*(c)}:E_1^*(c)\to\Delta_+\cup\Delta_-:d\mapsto\operatorname{proj}^*_{P_s(c)}(d)$, which holds by $\frac{1}{2}$(TTB2). $\square$

Combining the proposition and Lemma 4.1 we obtain:

Theorem 4.8. *Let* G *be a topological group with root group datum* $(\{U_\alpha\}_{\alpha\in\Phi},T)$*, let* $\Delta=\Delta(G,\{U_\alpha\}_{\alpha\in\Phi},T)$ *be the associated twin building, and equip both halves with the quotient topology. Assume the following:*

(i) $B_\pm$ *are closed.*

(ii) $G=\lim_\to\left(\bigcup_{l(w)\leq n}B_+wB_+\right)=\lim_\to\left(\bigcup_{l(w)\leq n}B_-wB_-\right)$.

(iii) The multiplication map $m\colon U_+\times T\times U_-\to B_+B_-$ *is open.*

(iv) Panels in Δ *are compact.*

Then Δ *is a topological twin building.*

Proof. We have to check axioms (TTB1)-(TTB6). (TTB1), (TTB3) and (TTB4) hold by assumption; moreover $\frac{1}{2}$ (TTB2) holds by the first part of Proposition 4.7. By Lemma 4.1 this implies that B_+B_- and B_-B_+ are open. Thus the second part of Proposition 4.7 applies and shows that also (TTB2) and (TTB5). Finally, (TTB6) is an immediate consequence of homogeneity, as remarked earlier in Section 3.1. $\square$

Remark 4.9. For an $\mathbb{F}$-locally split root group datum there is an easy condition which guarantees property (iv) above. Indeed, the panels of Δ are homeomorphic to $\mathbb{P}_1(\mathbb{F})$, the building of $\mathrm{SL}_2(\mathbb{F})$. If $\mathbb{F}$ is Hausdorff, non-discrete, σ-compact and locally compact, these are compact (cf. [SBG+95, Proposition 14.5 and Corollary 14.7]).

5 Topological split Kac-Moody groups

5.1 Abstract split Kac-Moody groups

In order to attack the integrability problem for Moufang topological foundations, we need a way to construct topological twin buildings out of local data. We will focus on homogeneous twin buildings, i.e. groups with twin BN-pair. It turns out that many homogeneous topological twin buildings can be constructed using the Kac-Moody functor. For the convenience of the reader we recall the relevant definitions:

Definition 5.1. A **generalised Cartan matrix** is a matrix $A = (a_{ij})_{1 \le i,j \le n} \in \mathbb{Z}^{n \times n}$ satisfying $a_{ii} = 2$, $a_{ij} \le 0$ for $i \neq j$, and $a_{ij} = 0$ if and only if $a_{ji} = 0$.

Let $I = \{1, \ldots, n\}$ and let $A = (a_{ij})_{1 \le i,j \le n}$ be a generalised Cartan matrix. A quintuple $\mathcal{D} = (I, A, \Lambda, \{c_i\}_{i \in I}, \{h_i\}_{i \in I})$ is called a **Kac–Moody root datum** if Λ is a free $\mathbb{Z}$-module, each c_i is an element of Λ and each h_i is in the $\mathbb{Z}$-dual $\Lambda^\vee$ of Λ such that for all $i, j \in I$ one has $h_i(c_j) = a_{ij}$.

The Kac–Moody root datum $\mathcal{D}$ is called **simply connected** if the set $\{h_i \mid i \in I\}$ is a $\mathbb{Z}$-basis of $\Lambda^\vee$ and **adjoint** if the set $\{c_i \mid i \in I\}$ is a $\mathbb{Z}$-basis of Λ.

Following [Tit87, 3.6] to a Kac–Moody root datum $\mathcal{D}$ one associates a triple $\mathcal{F} = (\mathcal{G}, \{\varphi_i\}_{i \in I}, \eta)$, where $\mathcal{G}$ is a group functor on the category of commutative unital rings, the φ_i are maps $\mathrm{SL}_2(R) \to \mathcal{G}(R)$, and η is a natural transformation $\mathrm{Hom}(\Lambda, -^\times) \to \mathcal{G}$ such that the following assertions hold:

(KMG1) If $\mathbb{F}$ is a field, then the group $\mathcal{G}(\mathbb{F})$ is generated by the images of the φ_i and $\eta(\mathbb{F})$.

(KMG2) For all rings R the homomorphism $\eta(R) : \mathrm{Hom}(\Lambda, R^\times) \to \mathcal{G}(R)$ is injective.

(KMG3) Given a ring R, $i \in I$ and $u \in R^\times$, one has $\varphi_i \begin{pmatrix} u & 0 \\ 0 & u^{-1} \end{pmatrix} = \eta(\lambda \mapsto u^{h_i(\lambda)})$.

(KMG4) If R is a ring, $\mathbb{F}$ is a field and $\iota : R \to \mathbb{F}$ is an injection, then $\mathcal{G}(\iota) : \mathcal{G}(R) \to \mathcal{G}(\mathbb{F})$ is injective as well.

(KMG5) If $\mathfrak{g}$ is the complex Kac-Moody algebra of type A, then there exists a homomorphism $\mathrm{Ad} : \mathcal{G}(\mathbb{C}) \to \mathrm{Aut}(\mathfrak{g})$ such that $\ker(\mathrm{Ad}) \subseteq \eta(\mathrm{Hom}(\Lambda, \mathbb{C}^\times))$ and for a given $z \in \mathbb{C}$ one has

$$\mathrm{Ad}\left(\varphi_i \begin{pmatrix} 1 & z \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}\right) = \exp(\mathrm{ad}_{ze_i}),$$
$$\mathrm{Ad}\left(\varphi_i \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ z & 1 \end{pmatrix}\right) = \exp(\mathrm{ad}_{-zf_i});$$

where $\{e_i, f_i\}$ are part of a standard $\mathfrak{sl}_2$-triple for the fundamental Kac–Moody sub-Lie algebra corresponding to the simple root α_i; furthermore, for every homomorphism $\gamma \in \mathrm{Hom}(\Lambda, \mathbb{C}^\times)$ one has

$$\mathrm{Ad}(\eta(\gamma))(e_i) = \gamma(c_i) \cdot e_i, \quad \mathrm{Ad}(\eta(\gamma))(f_i) = \gamma(-c_i) \cdot f_i.$$

For a given Kac–Moody root datum $\mathcal{D}$ the group $G_{\mathcal{D}}(R) := \mathcal{G}(R)$ is called a **split Kac–Moody group** of type $\mathcal{D}$ over R.

The main result of [Tit87] states that under some non-degeneracy assumptions any functor defined on the category of fields satisfying the above axioms must coincide with $\mathcal{G}$. The Kac–Moody root datum $\mathcal{D}$ is called **centred** if the following stronger version of (KMG1) is satisfied: If $\mathbb{F}$ is a field, then the group $\mathcal{G}(\mathbb{F})$ is generated by the images of the φ_i.

A split Kac–Moody group defined over a field is an example of a group with an RGD system:

Proposition 5.2 ([Rém02, Proposition 8.4.1], [Cap09, Lemma 1.4])**.** *Let $\mathbb{F}$ be a field, let $\mathcal{D} = (I, A, \Lambda, \{c_i\}_{i\in I}, \{h_i\}_{i\in I})$ be a Kac–Moody root datum, and let $G_{\mathcal{D}}(\mathbb{F}) := \mathcal{G}(\mathbb{F})$ be the corresponding split Kac–Moody group of type $\mathcal{D}$ over $\mathbb{F}$. Then $G_{\mathcal{D}}(\mathbb{F})$ admits an RGD system as follows. Let $M(A)$ be the associated Coxeter matrix of type (W, S) and choose a set of simple roots $\Pi = \{\alpha_i \mid i \in I\}$ such that the reflection associated to α_i is $s_i \in S$. Define the* **set of real roots** *as $\Phi^{re} := W.\Pi$. Given $i \in I$, let U_{α_i} and $U_{-\alpha_i}$ be the image of strictly upper or lower triangular matrices of* $\mathrm{SL}_2(\mathbb{F})$ *under the map φ_i, and define $T := \bigcap_{\alpha\in\Phi^{re}} N_{G_{\mathcal{D}}(\mathbb{F})}(U_\alpha)$.*

Then $(G_{\mathcal{D}}(\mathbb{F}), \{U_\alpha\}_{\alpha\in\Phi^{re}}, T)$ is an RGD system and $W \cong N_{G_{\mathcal{D}}(\mathbb{F})}(T)/T$. □

Remark 5.3. In general the action of a split Kac–Moody group $G_{\mathcal{D}}(\mathbb{F})$ on the associated twin building will not be effective; however the kernel $\mathcal{Z}_{\mathcal{D}}(\mathbb{F})$ of this action always equals the centre of $G_{\mathcal{D}}(\mathbb{F})$ (cf. [Rém02, Proposition 9.6.2]). Given a split Kac–Moody group $G_{\mathcal{D}}(\mathbb{F})$ we set $\mathrm{Ad}(G_{\mathcal{D}}(\mathbb{F})) := G_{\mathcal{D}}(\mathbb{F})/\mathcal{Z}_{\mathcal{D}}(\mathbb{F})$ and refer to $\mathrm{Ad}(G_{\mathcal{D}}(\mathbb{F}))$ as the **adjoint form** of $G_{\mathcal{D}}(\mathbb{F})$. This terminology will be justified in the subsequent Section 5.2. The group $\mathrm{Ad}(G_{\mathcal{D}}(\mathbb{F}))$ inherits a RGD system $(\mathrm{Ad}(G_{\mathcal{D}}(\mathbb{F})), \{U_\alpha\}_{\alpha\in\Phi^{re}}, T)$ from $G_{\mathcal{D}}(\mathbb{F})$, where T and the U_α are the images of the corresponding subgroups of $G_{\mathcal{D}}(\mathbb{F})$ under the canonical projection and Φ^{re} is as above (see [AB08, Chapter 8]). The twin buildings associated with $G_{\mathcal{D}}(\mathbb{F})$ and $\mathrm{Ad}(G_{\mathcal{D}}(\mathbb{F}))$ coincide, but the action of the latter group is effective.

The adjoint form $\mathrm{Ad}(G_{\mathcal{D}}(\mathbb{F}))$ should not be confused with the (adjoint) Kac–Moody group attached to the adjoint Kac–Moody root datum $\mathcal{D}^{ad}$ (cf. [Rém02, Proposition 9.6.2]). Indeed, while there is always a natural inclusion map $\mathrm{Ad}(G_{\mathcal{D}}(\mathbb{F})) \hookrightarrow G_{\mathcal{D}^{ad}}(\mathbb{F})$, this map need not be surjective. A finite-dimensional example of this phenomenon is $\mathrm{PSL}_n(\mathbb{R}) \lneq \mathrm{PGL}_n(\mathbb{R})$; the former group is the quotient of the simply connected group $\mathrm{SL}_n(\mathbb{R})$ modulo its centre, the latter is the corresponding adjoint group. Over algebraically closed fields, of course, there is no difference between the quotient of the simply connected group modulo its centre and the adjoint group.

From now on until Section 7.4 we will reserve the letter G to denote the adjoint form of a simply connected split Kac-Moody group $G_{\mathcal{D}^{sc}}(\mathbb{F})$ over a field $\mathbb{F}$ with its induced (centred) RGD system. Thereby we may assume that G acts effectively on the underlying twin building.

For every k-tuple $\overline{\alpha} = (\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_k) \in (\Phi^{re})^k$ of real roots we will denote by

$$G_{\overline{\alpha}} := G_{\alpha_1} \ldots G_{\alpha_k} \subset G$$

the subset of G consisting of product of the form

$$g = g_1 \cdots g_k, \quad (g_j \in G_{\alpha_j}).$$

Note that as a special case we have $G_\alpha = G_{(\alpha)}$. Now set $\overline{\alpha} \leq \overline{\beta}$ provided $\overline{\alpha}$ appears as an ordered subtuple of β; in this case there is an obvious embedding $G_{\overline{\alpha}} \hookrightarrow G_{\overline{\beta}}$. We record the following inclusion relations for later use:

Proposition 5.4. *Let B_+, B_- be the standard Borel subgroups of the adjoint form of $G_{\mathcal{D}}(\mathbb{F})$, let $k \in \mathbb{N}$, and let $\overline{\alpha} = (\alpha_1, ..., \alpha_k) \in (\Phi^{re})^k$. Then, for $\varepsilon \in \{+, -\}$, the set $G_{\overline{\alpha}}$ is contained in*

$$G_k^\varepsilon := \bigcup_{l(w)\leq k} B_\varepsilon w B_\varepsilon$$

and, thus, also in $G_k := G_k^+ \cap G_k^-$.

Proof. We prove the result by induction on $|\overline{\alpha}| = k$. For $k = 0$ there is nothing to show. Let $k > 0$ and assume that for all $\overline{\beta}$ with $|\overline{\beta}| < |\overline{\alpha}|$ the set $G_{\overline{\beta}}$ is contained in $G^\varepsilon_{|\overline{\beta}|}$. Hence, for $\overline{\alpha_0} = (\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_{k-1})$, the induction hypothesis yields $G_{\overline{\alpha_0}} \subseteq G^\varepsilon_{|\overline{\alpha_0}|}$. The Bruhat decomposition

$G_{\alpha_k} = B^{\varepsilon}_{\alpha_k} \cup B^{\varepsilon}_{\alpha_k} s_{\alpha_k} B^{\varepsilon}_{\alpha_k}$ (where $B^{\varepsilon}_{\alpha_k} := B_\varepsilon \cap G_{\alpha_k}$) implies

$$\begin{aligned} G_{\overline{\alpha}} = G_{\overline{\alpha_0}}.G_{\alpha_k} &\subseteq \left(\bigcup_{l(w)\leq k-1} B_\varepsilon w B_\varepsilon \right) . (B_\varepsilon^{\alpha_k} \cup B_\varepsilon^{\alpha_k} s_{\alpha_k} B_\varepsilon^{\alpha_k}) \\ &\subseteq \left(\bigcup_{l(w)\leq k-1} B_\varepsilon w B_\varepsilon \right) . (B_\varepsilon \cup B_\varepsilon s_{\alpha_k} B_\varepsilon) \\ &\overset{(TBN1)}{\subseteq} \bigcup_{l(w)\leq k-1} B_\varepsilon w B_\varepsilon \cup B_\varepsilon w s_{\alpha_k} B_\varepsilon \\ &\subseteq \bigcup_{l(w)\leq k} B_\varepsilon w B_\varepsilon . \end{aligned}$$

The claim follows. □

5.2 The adjoint representation

We keep our convention from the last section, i.e. $G_{\mathcal{D}}(\mathbb{F})$ is a simply connected split Kac-Moody group over a field $\mathbb{F}$ with its induced (centred) RGD system and $G := \mathrm{Ad}(G_{\mathcal{D}}(\mathbb{F}))$ denotes the associated adjoint form. In order to justify the terminology **adjoint form** we consider the corresponding complex Kac–Moody algebra $\mathfrak{g}$ associated to the generalised Cartan matrix A. We then denote by $\mathcal{U} := \mathcal{U}(\mathfrak{g})$ the universal enveloping algebra of $\mathfrak{g}$. For each $u \in \mathcal{U}$, let $u^{[n]} := (n!)^{-1}u^n$ and $\binom{u}{n} := (n!)^{-1} \cdot u \cdot (u-1) \cdot \cdots \cdot (u-n+1)$.

Let $Q := \sum_{\alpha\in\Pi} \mathbb{Z}\alpha$ be the free abelian group generated by the simple roots. Then, as in [Rém02, Section 7.3.1], the algebras $\mathcal{U}$ and $\mathfrak{g}$ admit an abstract Q-grading by declaring e_i and f_i to be of degree α_i and $-\alpha_i$, respectively, and extending linearly.

With this notation, set $\mathcal{U}_0$ to be the subring of $\mathcal{U}$ generated by the elements of degree 0 of the form $\binom{h}{n}$, where $h \in \mathfrak{h}, n \in \mathbb{N}$. Moreover, define $\mathcal{U}_{\alpha_i}$ and $\mathcal{U}_{-\alpha_i}$ to be the subrings $\sum_{n\in\mathbb{N}} \mathbb{Z}e_i^{[n]}$ and $\sum_{n\in\mathbb{N}} \mathbb{Z}f_i^{[n]}$, respectively. Let $\mathcal{U}_{\mathbb{Z}}$ be the subring of $\mathcal{U}$ generated by $\mathcal{U}_0$ and $\{\mathcal{U}_{\pm\alpha} \mid \alpha \in \Pi\}$. Then $\mathcal{U}_{\mathbb{Z}}$ is a $\mathbb{Z}$-form of $\mathcal{U}$, i.e., the canonical map $\mathcal{U}_{\mathbb{Z}} \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} \mathbb{C} \to \mathcal{U}$ is a bijection, cf. [Tit87, Section 4], [Rém02, Proposition 7.4.3].

This construction allows one to replace the field $\mathbb{C}$ with an arbitrary field $\mathbb{F}$: define $\mathcal{U}_{\mathbb{F}} := \mathcal{U}_{\mathbb{Z}} \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} \mathbb{F}$. Let $\mathrm{Aut}_{\mathrm{filt}}(\mathcal{U}_{\mathbb{F}})$ be the automorphism group of $\mathcal{U}_R$ which preserves the above Q-grading.

Proposition 5.5 ([Rém02, Proposition 9.5.2])**.** *Let $G_{\mathcal{D}}(\mathbb{F})$ be a split Kac–Moody group over a field $\mathbb{F}$ and let T denote its standard maximal torus. Then there exists a morphism of groups*

$$\mathrm{Ad} : G_{\mathcal{D}}(\mathbb{F}) \to \mathrm{Aut}_{\mathrm{filt}}(\mathcal{U}_{\mathbb{F}})$$

which is characterised by the following axioms, where α_i is a real root, $r \in \mathbb{F}$ and $h \in T$:

(i) $\mathrm{Ad}(x_{\alpha_i}(r)) = \exp(\mathrm{ad}_{e_i} \otimes r) = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{(\mathrm{ad}_{e_i})^n}{n!} \otimes r^n$,

(ii) $\mathrm{Ad}(T)$ *fixes* $\mathcal{U}_0$,

(iii) $\mathrm{Ad}(h)(e_i \otimes r) = h^*(\alpha_i^\vee)(e_i \otimes r)$. □

It turns out that the kernel of the adjoint representation is precisely the centre of the group $G_{\mathcal{D}}(\mathbb{F})$, whence the image $\mathrm{Ad}(G_{\mathcal{D}}(R))$ is isomorphic to G. This justifies the name **adjoint form**. By definition, the adjoint action of G is faithful, hence we can consider G as a subgroup of $\mathrm{Aut}_{\mathrm{filt}}(\mathcal{U}_{\mathbb{F}})$.

We now collect some (algebraic) results concerning the adjoint representation which will play a crucial result in our discussion of group topologies on Kac-Moody groups over topological fields in the next subsection. In the sequel, given a topological field $\mathbb{F}$ we equip the space $\mathbb{F}^{n\times n}$ of $(n \times n)$ matrices over $\mathbb{F}$ with the product topology and obtain a Hausdorff group topology $\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{F}}$ on the open subset $\mathrm{GL}_n(\mathbb{F})$.

Proposition 5.6. *Let $\mathbb{F}$ be a field and let G be the adjoint form of some $G_{\mathcal{D}^{sc}}(\mathbb{F})$. There exists a family of subspaces $\{V_{\overline{\alpha}}\}_{\overline{\alpha}\in(\Phi^{re})^k}$ of $\mathcal{U}_{\mathbb{F}}$ with the following properties:*

(i) $\dim V_{\overline{\alpha}} < \infty$.

(ii) $V_{\overline{\alpha}}$ *is* $G_{\overline{\alpha}}$*-invariant.*

(iii) *If* $\overline{\alpha} \leq \overline{\beta}$ *then* $V_{\overline{\alpha}} < V_{\overline{\beta}}$.

(iv) *The map* $\rho_{\overline{\alpha}} := \mathrm{Ad}|_{G_{\overline{\alpha}}}^{\mathrm{GL}(V_{\overline{\alpha}})} : G_{\overline{\alpha}} \to \mathrm{GL}(V_{\overline{\alpha}})$ *is injective.*

(v) *If* $\mathbb{F}$ *is endowed with a locally compact, σ-compact field topology, then the images of* $U_{\pm\alpha} \subset G_\alpha$ *in* $(\mathrm{GL}(V_{\overline{\beta}}), \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{F}})$ *are closed subgroups for all* $\overline{\beta} \geq \overline{\alpha}$

Proof. By induction we first construct spaces $V_{\overline{\alpha}}$ satisfying (i) – (iv); we then establish that these also satisfy (v). Concerning the basis of induction, we start with the case $\overline{\alpha} = \alpha$. There exists a vector $v_\alpha \in \mathcal{U}_{\mathbb{F}}$ such that the orbit map $G_\alpha \to \mathcal{U}_{\mathbb{F}}$ given by $g \mapsto g.v_\alpha$ is injective. Indeed, by [Kac90, Proposition 3.6] the vector space $\mathcal{U}_{\mathbb{F}}$ decomposes into a direct sum of finite-dimensional G_α-modules. As the adjoint action of G_α on $\mathcal{U}_{\mathbb{F}}$ is faithful, it is possible to choose a tuple of vectors, one in each of these modules, in such a way that the only element of G_α that admits each of these vectors as an eigenvector with eigenvalue 1 is the identity element.

The Bruhat decomposition of the rank one subgroup G_α of G implies that the product map $U_\alpha \times U_{-\alpha} \times U_\alpha \times U_{-\alpha} \to G_\alpha$ is surjective ([Ste68, Lemma 24]). The adjoint action of $u_\alpha(q) \in U_\alpha \subseteq G_\alpha$ on $\mathcal{U}_{\mathbb{F}}$ is given by $\mathrm{Ad}(u_\alpha(q)) = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \left(\frac{(\mathrm{ad}_{e_i})^n}{n!} \otimes q^n \right)$. Hence, by the Bruhat decomposition, the vector space

$$V_\alpha := \sum_{k,l,m,n\in\mathbb{N}} \left\langle \left(\frac{(\mathrm{ad}_{e_\alpha})^k}{k!} \otimes 1 \right) \left(\frac{(\mathrm{ad}_{f_\alpha})^l}{l!} \otimes 1 \right) \left(\frac{(\mathrm{ad}_{e_\alpha})^m}{m!} \otimes 1 \right) \left(\frac{(\mathrm{ad}_{f_\alpha})^n}{n!} \otimes 1 \right) .v_\alpha \right\rangle_{\mathbb{F}}$$

contains $\langle G_\alpha.v \rangle_{\mathbb{F}}$. By construction V_α is $\mathrm{Ad}|_{G_\alpha}$-invariant. From the local nilpotency of ad_{e_i} and ad_{f_i}, we may conclude that the above sum is finite and hence V_α has finite dimension. This finishes the construction for all $\overline{\alpha}$ of length one. Now assume by induction that a space $V_{\overline{\alpha}}$ subject to (i) – (iv) have been constructed for all $\overline{\alpha}$ of lenght $< k$ and let $\overline{\alpha} = (\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_k) \in (\Phi^{re})^k$. We will construct a finite-dimensional, $G_{\overline{\alpha}}$-invariant subspace V, which contains $V_{\alpha_1,\dots,\alpha_{k-1}}$. A similar construction then yields invariant subspaces containing $V_{\overline{\beta}}$ for all maximal subwords $\beta \lneq \alpha$ and we can take their union to be $V_{\overline{\alpha}}$. Since this union contains all V_{α_j}, it will automatically satisfy Property (iv). To construct V just take a basis $\{v_1, \dots, v_m\}$ of $V_{\alpha_1,\dots,\alpha_{k-1}}$ and observe that similar as above for each $1 \leq j \leq m$ there exists a G_{α_k}-invariant finite-dimensional sub-$\mathbb{F}$-vector space V_i of $\mathcal{U}_{\mathbb{F}}$ containing v_j. We may thus choose $V := \sum_{j=1}^m V_j$.

This established the existence of the spaces $V_{\overline{\alpha}}$ and it remains to establish (v). For this we fix $\overline{\alpha} \leq \overline{\beta}$. If $\mathrm{char}(\mathbb{F}) = 0$, then the embedding $\iota_{\overline{\alpha}\overline{\beta}} : G_{\overline{\alpha}} \hookrightarrow \mathrm{GL}(V_{\overline{\beta}})$ is analytic ([Bou89, Theorem III.8.1]), hence the image is a submanifold and, thus, closed ([Bou89, Proposition III.1.5]). Therefore also the root subgroups are closed. Thus assume $\mathrm{char}(\mathbb{F}) = p > 0$ and denote by $\mathbb{K} \subset \mathbb{F}$ the prime field. By construction, the embedding $\iota_{\overline{\alpha}\overline{\beta}}$ is defined over $\mathbb{K}$, i.e., $G_{\overline{\alpha}}$ and $\mathrm{GL}(V_{\overline{\beta}})$ are defined over $\mathbb{K}$ and their exists a morphism $\iota^{\mathbb{K}}_{\overline{\alpha}\overline{\beta}}$ between the groups of $\mathbb{K}$-points such that $\iota_{\overline{\alpha}\overline{\beta}} = \iota^{\mathbb{K}}_{\overline{\alpha}\overline{\beta}} \otimes_{\mathbb{K}} \mathbb{F}$. Since $\mathbb{K}$ is finite with cyclic additive group, the potential images of unipotent one-parameter groups under $\iota^{\mathbb{K}}_{\overline{\alpha}\overline{\beta}}$ are severely restricted. Indeed, the image of a generator of a unipotent one-parameter group has to be p-singular and therefore there exists a basis of $V_{\overline{\beta}}$ with respect to which it is upper triangular. On Lie-algebra level this implies that the span (as a group) of its image is a one-dimensional $\mathbb{K}$-subvector space. After tensoring with $\mathbb{F}$ this becomes a (closed) one-dimensional $\mathbb{F}$-subvector space, so, in particular, the image of the unipotent one-parameter group over $\mathbb{F}$ has to be closed. □

5.3 The Kac-Peterson topology I: k_ω-property

We now aim to define a group topology on split Kac-Moody groups over local fields. Here and in the sequel we will use the term **local field** as a shorthand for a Hausdorff non-discrete locally compact σ-compact field. Recall that an archimedean local field is isomorphic to either $\mathbb{R}$ or $\mathbb{C}$, whereas the non-archimedean fields of characteristic p respectively 0 are finite extensions of $\mathbb{F}_q((t))$ respectively $\mathbb{Q}_p$ ([Wei95, I, §3]). Given a local field $\mathbb{F}$ we are going to construct a group topology on every split Kac-Moody group over $\mathbb{F}$. Throughout we will imitate closely the arguments given in [GGH10, Section 6] for unitary forms of complex Kac–Moody groups. The main difference is that we use the adjoint representation on the associative algebra $\mathcal{U}_\mathbb{F}$ instead of the Kac–Moody Lie algebra. This will allow us to include the case of positive characteristic.

From now on we will reserve the letter $\mathbb{F}$ to denote a local field, the letter $\mathcal{D}$ to denote a simply connected Kac–Moody root datum, and the letter G to denote the adjoint form (cf. Remark 5.3) of the associated Kac–Moody group $G_\mathcal{D}(\mathbb{F})$. The latter assumption will allow us to identify G with its image under the adjoint representation. As before, we equip the space $\mathbb{F}^{n\times n}$ of $(n \times n)$ matrices over $\mathbb{F}$ with the product topology and obtain a Hausdorff group topology $\mathcal{O}_\mathbb{F}$ on the open subset $\mathrm{GL}_n(\mathbb{F})$. We also obtain a Hausdorff topology on $\mathrm{SL}_2(\mathbb{F}) < \mathrm{GL}_2(\mathbb{F})$, which we denote by the same letter $\mathcal{O}_\mathbb{F}$. Starting from this topology on the rank one subgroups we will now provide two constructions of a group topology on G. We will ultimately show that the two topologies coincide, but for the moment let us carefully distinguish between them.

Our first construction of a topology is inspired by a construction of Kac and Peterson in the complex case [GGH10], [KP83a]. We start by defining topologies on the pieces $G_{\overline{\alpha}}$ introduced above.

Definition 5.7. Let G be the adjoint form of a simply connected split Kac–Moody group over a local field $\mathbb{F}$ and let $\overline{\alpha} = (\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_k) \in (\Phi^{re})^k$. Define

$$p_{\overline{\alpha}}\colon (\mathrm{SL}_2(\mathbb{F})^k, \mathcal{O}_\mathbb{F}) \to G_{\overline{\alpha}}$$

as the composition of

$$\varphi_{\alpha_1} \times \cdots \times \varphi_{\alpha_k} : (\mathrm{SL}_2(\mathbb{F})^k, \mathcal{O}_\mathbb{F}) \to G_{\alpha_1} \times \cdots \times G_{\alpha_k}$$

with the multiplication map of G. Also, define $\tau_{\overline{\alpha}}$ to be the quotient topology on $G_{\overline{\alpha}}$ with respect to the map $p_{\overline{\alpha}}$.

Note that the topological spaces $(G_{\overline{\alpha}}, \tau_{\overline{\alpha}})$ form a directed system with respect to the order defined above.

Definition 5.8. The **Kac–Peterson topology** τ_{KP} on G is the direct limit topology with respect to the directed system $\{(G_{\overline{\alpha}}, \tau_{\overline{\alpha}})\}_{\overline{\alpha}}$.

The definition makes sense for any Hausdorff topological field $\mathbb{F}$, but without further assumptions we will not be able to show that the Kac-Peterson topology is a group topology. Among other things we have to circumvene the problem, that for general topological spaces G_i,

$$\lim_{\rightarrow} G_i \times \lim_{\rightarrow} G_j \ncong \lim_{\rightarrow}(G_i \times G_j).$$

It turns out that assuming $\mathbb{F}$ to be locally compact and σ-compact is sufficient for our purposes.

Proposition 5.9. *Let $\mathbb{F}$ be a local field and let G be the adjoint form of a simply connected split Kac–Moody group. Then the Kac–Peterson topology is a k_ω group topology on G. Moreover, the subgroups $U_\alpha < G$ are closed with respect to the Kac–Peterson topology.*

Proof. Choose a family of subspaces $\{V_{\overline{\alpha}}\}_{\overline{\alpha}\in(\Phi^{re})^k}$ of $\mathcal{U}_\mathbb{F}$ as in Proposition 5.6. Since the embedding $(G_{\overline{\alpha}}, \tau_{\overline{\alpha}}) \to \mathrm{GL}(V_{\overline{\alpha}}, \mathcal{O}_\mathbb{F})$ is continuous, we deduce that $\tau_{\overline{\alpha}}$ is a Hausdorff topology; it is then k_ω by [GGH10, Prop. 4.2(d)]. By construction the multiplication $G_{\overline{\alpha}} \times G_{\overline{\beta}} \to G_{\overline{\gamma}}$ is continuous for all sufficiently large γ. Then continuity of the multiplication on (G, τ_{KP}) follows from [GGH10, Proposition 4.7]. Continuity of the inversion is established similarly. Now we observe that points are closed (since they are closed in each $G_{\overline{\alpha}}$). Thus G is a topological group with closed points, hence Hausdorff. As a Hausdorff limit of k_ω-spaces it is also k_ω. This finished the proof of the first statement. The second statement follows immediately from Proposition 5.6(v). □

The following result is now an immediate consequence of Proposition 5.4:

Corollary 5.10. *Let $\mathbb{F}$ be a local field, let G be the adjoint form of a simply connected split Kac–Moody group over $\mathbb{F}$, and let*

$$G_k^\varepsilon := \bigcup_{l(w)\leq k} B_\varepsilon w B_\varepsilon.$$

Then (G, τ_{KP}) is the direct limit of the directed systems

$$\bigcup_{k\in\mathbb{N}} (G_k^+, \tau_{KP}|_{G_k^+}), \quad \bigcup_{k\in\mathbb{N}} (G_k^-, \tau_{KP}|_{G_k^-}), \quad \bigcup_{k\in\mathbb{N}} (G_k^+ \cap G_k^-, \tau_{KP}|_{G_k^+\cap G_k^-}).$$

5.4 Closed subgroups

We keep the notation of the last subsection. In particular $\mathbb{F}$ denotes a local field and G the adjoint form of a simply connected split Kac–Moody group over $\mathbb{F}$ endowed with the Kac–Peterson topology. Before we can continue our study of this topology we need to identify various closed subgroups. From Proposition 5.9 we already know that the root subgroups U_α are closed in $(G_{\mathcal{D}}(\mathbb{F}), \tau_{KP})$. From this we deduce:

Proposition 5.11. *Let $\mathbb{F}$ be a local field and let G be the adjoint form of a simply connected split Kac–Moody group over $\mathbb{F}$. Then the Borel subgroups B_+, B_- are closed with respect to τ_{KP}.*

Proof. By symmetry and by Corollary 5.10 it suffices to show that the Borel subgroup $B_+ = T.U_+$ is relatively closed in each of the spaces $(G_k^-, \tau_{KP}|_{G_k^-})$. The Bruhat decomposition of G implies that $\bigcup_{l(w)\leq k} B_- w B_-$ intersects U_+ in exactly those root groups U_α with $\mathrm{ht}(\alpha) \leq k$. Hence we obtain

$$B_+ \cap G_k^- = B_+ \cap \left(\bigcup_{l(w)\leq k} B_- w B_- \right) \cong T \times \prod_{\alpha\in\Phi^+, \mathrm{ht}(\alpha)\leq k} U_\alpha.$$

By Proposition 5.9 each root subgroup U_α is closed with respect to τ_{KP}. Therefore also $T = \bigcap_{\alpha\in\Phi^{re}} N_G(U_\alpha)$ is closed, and so is the above product of topological spaces. □

From this in turn we obtain that the groups G_α are also closed:

Corollary 5.12. *Let $\mathbb{F}$ be a local field and let G be the adjoint form of a simply connected split Kac–Moody group over $\mathbb{F}$. Equip the halves $\Delta^\pm$ of the associated twin building with the quotient topology with respect to the Kac–Peterson topology.*

(i) *$\Delta^\pm$ are k_ω-spaces.*

(ii) *Panels in $\Delta^\pm$ are compact.*

(iii) *For every real root α the restriction of τ_{KP} to G_α coincides with $\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{F}}$.*

(iv) *The subgroups $G_\alpha < G_{\mathcal{D}}(\mathbb{F})$ are closed with respect to the Kac-Peterson topology.*

Proof. (i) This is immediate by Proposition 5.11 and [GGH10, Proposition 4.2(d)].

(ii) The (continuous) action of the group $(G_\alpha, \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{F}})$ on the twin building preserves the panel P_α; denote by $B_\alpha < G_\alpha$ the point stabilizer of a basepoint in P_α. We then get a continuous bijection between G_α/B_α and P_α. The former is compact (see Remark 4.9) and the latter is Hausdorff by (i), whence the latter is compact as it is a Hausdorff quotient of a compact space.

(iii) Denote by τ_{co} the compact open topology on G_α with respect to the action on P_α. Then we have continuous maps

$$(G_\alpha, \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{F}}) \to (G_\alpha, \tau_{KP}) \to (G_\alpha, \tau_{co}).$$

However, we have $\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{F}} = \tau_{co}$, so in fact all three topologies coincide.

(iv) By (iii) the subgroups G_α are locally compact, hence must be closed. □

Remark 5.13. The same proof shows that for every spherical subdiagram the restriction of the Kac-Peterson topology to the corresponding subgroup coincides with the Lie group topology.

5.5 Kac–Peterson topology II: Universality

We will now compare the Kac–Peterson topology to the following more natural (but also more elusive) topology on (the adjoint form of) a split Kac–Moody group:

Definition 5.14. Let $\mathbb{F}$ be a local field and let G be the adjoint form of a simply connected split Kac–Moody group over $\mathbb{F}$. Then the **universal topology** τ on G is defined to be the final group topology with respect to the maps $\varphi_\alpha : \mathrm{SL}_2(\mathbb{F}) \to G$, $\alpha \in \Phi^{re}$, where $\mathrm{SL}_2(\mathbb{F})$ is equipped with the Lie group topology $\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{F}}$ defined above.

Again the universal topology can be defined for general topological fields, but it is unclear to us whether it has any good properties in general; we do not even know whether it is Hausdorff. However, over local fields we can show the following:

Proposition 5.15. *Assume $\mathbb{F}$ is a local field. Then the universal topology and the Kac–Peterson topology coincide. In particular, (G, τ) is Hausdorff and k_ω.*

Proof. Since the inclusion maps $G_\alpha \to (G, \tau_{KP})$ are continuous, we obtain a continuous map $(G, \tau) \to (G, \tau_{KP})$. It remains to show that this map is open. In view of Corollary 5.12(iii), the topologies coincide on each G_α. Since multiplication is continuous, the map $(G_{\overline{\alpha}}, \tau_{\overline{\alpha}}) \to (G_{\overline{\alpha}}, \tau|_{G_{\overline{\alpha}}})$ is continuous. On the other hand the map

$$(G_{\overline{\alpha}}, \tau|_{G_{\overline{\alpha}}}) \to (G_{\overline{\alpha}}, \tau_{KP}|_{G_{\overline{\alpha}}}) = (G_{\overline{\alpha}}, \tau_{\overline{\alpha}})$$

is continuous as the restriction of a continuous map. Altogether we have shown that τ and τ_{KP} coincide on each $G_{\overline{\alpha}}$. It then follows that they coincide globally. □

Remark 5.16. The definition of the universal topology given in 5.14 is equivalent to the one given in [KP83b, Section 4G] using parametrisations of the root groups as follows. Let G be the adjoint form of a simply connected split Kac–Moody group over a local field $\mathbb{F}$. For each simple root α, choose a parametrisation $x_{\pm\alpha} \colon \mathbb{F} \to U_{\pm\alpha}$ of the root groups. For each finite set of positive or negative simple roots $\overline{\beta} = (\beta_1, \ldots, \beta_k)$ denote by

$$x_{\overline{\beta}} \colon \mathbb{F}^k \to G : (t_1, \ldots, t_k) \mapsto x_{\beta_1}(t_1) \cdots x_{\beta_k}(t_k)$$

the composition of the chosen parametrisations with the product map of G, and let $U_{\overline{\beta}}$ denote the image of $x_{\overline{\beta}}$. As, by the Gauss algorithm, for each simple root α one has $G_\alpha = U_\alpha U_{-\alpha} U_\alpha U_{-\alpha}$, the final topology on G with respect to the maps $x_{\overline{\beta}}$ coincides with the Kac–Peterson topology.

We note that, if the Kac–Moody root datum is two-spherical, then because of the commutator relations there exists a cofinal sequence β_1, β_2, ... such that for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$ there exists an $m \in \mathbb{N}$ such that for each $u_+ \in U_+$, $t \in T$, $u_- \in U_-$ the inclusion $u_+ t u_- \in U_{\overline{\beta'}}$ implies $u_+, t, u_- \in U_{\overline{\beta''}}$ where $\overline{\beta'} = (\beta_1, ..., \beta_n)$ and $\overline{\beta''} = (\beta_1, ..., \beta_m)$. Such a cofinal sequence is called **compatible** with the root group datum. We remark that m generically will need to grow exponentially in n.

The universal topology has been defined as the final topology with respect to all root groups. We can give a more efficient presentation as follows:

Lemma 5.17 (cf. [GGH10, Lemma 6.2])**.** *Let $\mathbb{F}$ be a local field, let G be the adjoint form of a simply connected split Kac–Moody group, and let $\Pi = \{\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n\}$ be a basis of simple roots of Φ^{re}. Then the universal topology on G is the final group topology with respect to the maps $(\varphi_{\alpha_i})_{1 \leq i \leq n}$.*

Proof. It suffices to observe that for every real root α there exists $w \in W$ and $\alpha_i \in \Pi$ such that $\alpha = w.\alpha_i$, whence for any representative $\tilde{w}$ of w in G, one has $G_\alpha = G_{w.\alpha_i} = \tilde{w} G_{\alpha_i} \tilde{w}^{-1}$. □

We thus end up with the following amalgamation result that generalises [GGH10, Theorem 6.20].

Theorem 5.18 (Topological Curtis–Tits Theorem)**.** *Let $\mathbb{F}$ be a local field and let G be the adjoint form of a two-spherical simply connected split Kac–Moody group. Let Φ^{re} be the set of real roots and let Π be a basis of simple roots for Φ^{re}. For $\alpha, \beta \in \Pi$, set $G_\alpha := \varphi_\alpha(\mathrm{SL}_2(\mathbb{F}))$ and $G_{\alpha\beta} := \langle G_\alpha \cup G_\beta \rangle$. Moreover, let $\iota_{\alpha\beta} \colon G_\alpha \hookrightarrow G_{\alpha\beta}$ be the canonical inclusion morphisms.*

Then the group (G, τ_{KP}) is a universal enveloping group of the amalgam $\{G_\alpha, G_{\alpha\beta}; \iota_{\alpha\beta}\}$ in the categories of

(i) *abstract groups,*

(ii) *Hausdorff topological groups and*

(iii) *k_ω groups.*

Proof. (i) This is the main result of [AM97].

(ii) By Proposition 5.15 and Lemma 5.17 the group (G, τ_{KP}) is the direct limit of the amalgam $\{G_\alpha, G_{\alpha\beta}; \iota_{\alpha\beta}\}$ in the category of topological groups. Since τ_{KP} is Hausdorff by Proposition 5.15 the claim follows.

(iii) By (ii), the claim follows from [GGH10, Corollary 5.10]. □

5.6 The topological twin building of a split Kac-Moody group

The goal of this section is to establish the first main result of this paper:

Theorem 1. *Let G be the adjoint form of a two-spherical simply connected split Kac-Moody group over a local field and let τ_{KP} be the Kac–Peterson topology on G. Then the associated twin building endowed with the quotient topology is a topological twin building.*

We will prove Theorem 1 by establishing the hypotheses of Theorem 4.8. Note that we already have established Condition (i) in Proposition 5.11, Condition (ii) in Corollary 5.10 and Condition (iv) in Corollary 5.12. It thus remains only to establish Conditions (iii).

Proposition 5.19. *Let $\mathbb{F}$ be a local field and let G be the adjoint form of a two-spherical simply connected split Kac–Moody group over $\mathbb{F}$ endowed with the Kac–Peterson topology. Then the map $m \colon U_+ \times T \times U_- \to B_+B_- : (u_+, t, u_-) \mapsto u_+ t u_-$ is open.*

Proof. Let β_1, β_2, ... be a cofinal sequence that is compatible with the root group datum (cf. Remark 5.16). We observe that this means that for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$ there exists an $m \in \mathbb{N}$ with

$$B_+B_- \cap U_{\overline{\beta'}} \subseteq (U_+ \cap U_{\overline{\beta''}})(T \cap U_{\overline{\beta''}})(U_- \cap U_{\overline{\beta''}}),$$

where $\overline{\beta'} = (\beta_1, ..., \beta_n)$ and $\overline{\beta''} = (\beta_1, ..., \beta_m)$. Since $U_\pm = \lim_\to U_\pm \cap U_{\overline{\beta}}$ and $T = \lim_\to T \cap U_{\overline{\beta}}$, by [GGH10, Proposition 4.7] one has

$$U_+ \times T \times U_- = \lim_{\to} A_{\overline{\beta}}$$

for $A_{\overline{\beta}} := (U_+ \cap U_{\overline{\beta}}) \times (T \cap U_{\overline{\beta}}) \times (U_- \cap U_{\overline{\beta}})$. As $m(A_{\overline{\beta}})$ leaves invariant a finite-dimensional $\mathbb{F}$-subspace V of $\mathcal{U}_\mathbb{F}$ by Proposition 5.6, the topology on $m(A_{\overline{\beta}}) \subseteq \mathrm{GL}(V)$ is the one induced by $\mathbb{F}$, and therefore $m_{|A_{\overline{\beta}}}$ is an open map. As $B_+B_- = \lim_\to B_+B_- \cap U_{\overline{\beta}}$, the compatibility of the cofinal sequence β_1, β_2, ... implies $B_+B_- = \lim_\to B_+B_- \cap m(A_{\overline{\beta}})$. Therefore m is open. □

This finishes the proof of Theorem 1.

5.7 Kac–Moody symmetric spaces

We conclude with a couple of observations related to Kac–Moody symmetric spaces using the theory of flips introduced in [GHM11] and [Hor09].

Lemma 5.20. *Let $\mathbb{F}$ be a field, let $\mathcal{D}$ be a centered Kac–Moody root datum, let $G_{\mathcal{D}}(\mathcal{F})$ be the corresponding split Kac–Moody group, let θ be a quasi-flip of the Kac–Moody group such that $\theta(B_+) = B_-$, let $\tau_\theta \colon G_{\mathcal{D}}(\mathbb{F}) \to G_{\mathcal{D}}(\mathbb{F}) : g \mapsto \theta(g)^{-1}g$ be the corresponding Lang map, let W be its Weyl group, let $w \in W$, and let $x \in G_{\mathcal{D}}(\mathbb{F})$. Then $\delta^*(\theta(xB_+), xB_+) = w$ if and only if $x \in \tau_\theta^{-1}(B_-wB_+)$.*

Proof. One has the following chain of equivalences:

$$\begin{aligned} \delta^*(\theta(xB_+), xB_+) = w \quad &\Longleftrightarrow \quad B_-\theta(x)^{-1}xB_+ = B_-wB_+ \\ &\Longleftrightarrow \quad \theta(x)^{-1}x \in B_-wB_+ \\ &\Longleftrightarrow \quad \tau_\theta(x) \in B_-wB_+ \\ &\Longleftrightarrow \quad x \in \tau_\theta^{-1}(B_-wB_+). \quad \square \end{aligned}$$

Theorem 5.21. *Let $\mathbb{F}$ be a local field, let G be the adjoint form of a simply connected split Kac–Moody group endowed with the Kac–Peterson topology τ_{KP}, let W be its Weyl group, let θ be a continuous quasi-flip of G such that $\theta(B_+) = B_-$, and let $G_\theta = C_G(\theta)$. Moreover, for $w \in W$, let $\Delta_w := \{c \in \Delta_+ \mid \delta^*(\theta(c), c) = w\}$. Furthermore, let $\mathrm{Cod}(\theta) := \{w \in W \mid \Delta_w \neq \emptyset\}$. Then the following hold:*

(i) *For $w \in \mathrm{Cod}(\theta)$ one has*

$$\overline{\Delta_w} = \bigcup_{w' \geq w} \Delta_{w'}.$$

(ii) *For $w \in \mathrm{Cod}(\theta)$ the smallest open G_θ-invariant subset of Δ_+ containing Δ_w is*

$$\bigcup_{w' \leq w} \Delta_{w'}.$$

Proof. Using the quotient map $q \colon G \to \Delta_+ = G/B_+$, Lemma 5.20 states that for each $w \in W$ the set $q(\tau_\theta^{-1}(B_-wB_+)$ equals Δ_w. As θ is continuous, so is the Lang map $\tau_\theta \colon G \to G : g \mapsto \theta(g)^{-1}g$, whence all claims follow immediately from Theorem 4.4. $\square$

6 Classification of split topological twin buildings

6.1 Topological Moufang foundations

In this section we explain an approach towards the classification of certain classes of topological twin buildings. Abstract rank one buildings are not of any interest; various obstacles towards a complete classification are already apparent in rank two buildings of irreducible type. Firstly, the automorphism group of a given compact projective plane may be small; in this cases a classification seems impossible. Thus, already in the classification of compact projective planes one has to assume some homogeneity condition [SBG$^+$95]. Secondly, there is an apparent difference between twin trees and spherical rank two buildings: While the latter admit a unique twinning, the same pair of trees may admit many different twinnings [RT99, (1.1)]. In order to avoid problems arising from non-uniqueness of twinnings, we will from now on restrict attention to buildings of two-spherical type (W, S). This means that all rank two residues are assumed to be spherical, or equivalently that there are no tree residues. In order to obtain a class of topological twin buildings amenable to classification we further restrict ourselves to those spherical rank two residues which satisfy the **Moufang condition**. We refer the reader to [TW02] for an introduction to and basic definitions concerning such **Moufang polygons**. In the sequel we will refer to a topological twin building all of whose rank two residues are spherical and Moufang simply as a **Moufang topological twin building**. These purely algebraic assumptions yield transitivity of the topological automorphism group, as pointed out to us by Linus Kramer.

Proposition 6.1. *Let Δ be a Moufang topological twin building, i.e., a topological twin building whose rank two residues are both spherical and Moufang. Then the topological automorphism group* $\mathrm{Aut}(\Delta)$ *acts transitively on the halves of* Δ.

Proof. By [AB08, Proposition 8.19 and Theorem 8.81] there exists a group with centered RGD system, which acts transitively by automorphisms on the halves of the abstract twin building underlying Δ. We claim that this action is actually by homeomorphisms. For this it suffices to show that each of the root groups acts by homeomorphism. However, each of the root groups acts trivially on one panel of each type, whence we conclude by Corollary 3.18. $\square$

Under various conditions, Moufang twin buildings can be classified by local data, so-called **Moufang foundations**, see [Müh99], [MVM98], [RT87]. A topological analogon of foundations is provided by the following definition:

Definition 6.2. Let (W,S) be a 2-spherical Coxeter system and denote by $E \subset \binom{S}{2}$ the set of edges in the Coxeter graph of (W,S). A **topological Moufang foundation** of type (W,S) is a triple

$$\mathcal{F} = (\{\Delta_J \mid J \in E\}, \{c_J \mid J \in E\}, \{\theta_{jik} \mid \{i,j\}, \{j,k\} \in E\})$$

with the following properties:

(TMF1) Each Δ_J is a topological Moufang polygon and $c_J \in \Delta_J$.

(TMF2) $\theta_{jik} : \mathrm{Pan}_i(c_{j,i}) \to \mathrm{Pan}_i(c_{i,k})$ is a base-point preserving homeomorphism and an isomorphism of Moufang sets.

(TMF3) The θ_{jik} satisfy the cocycle condition $\theta_{kil} \circ \theta_{jik} = \theta_{jil}$.

Key examples of topological Moufang foundations arise from Moufang topological twin buildings: Indeed, let Δ be a Moufang topological twin building and $c \in \Delta_+ \cup \Delta_-$ a base chamber. We then obtain a topological Moufang foundation by setting $\Delta_J := \mathrm{Res}_J(c)$, $c_J := c$ and θ_{jik} the restriction of the identity map of Δ. This topological Moufang foundation will be denoted $\mathcal{F}(\Delta, c)$ and called the **collapse** of Δ along c.

Definition 6.3. A topological twin building is said to **globalize** a topological Moufang foundation $\mathcal{F}$ if there exists $c \in \Delta_+ \cup \Delta_-$ with $\mathcal{F}(\Delta, c) \cong \mathcal{F}$; the foundation is then called **integrable**.

Up to isomorphism the foundation $\mathcal{F}(\Delta, c)$ associated with a Moufang topological twin building only depends on Δ. We thus denote its isomorphism class by $[\mathcal{F}(\Delta)]$.

If one forgets about topologies in Definition 6.2 then one obtains the definition of an (abstract) Moufang foundation. Under our standing two-sphericity assumption an integrable Moufang foundation determines the ambient twin building unquely, provided the Coxeter diagram of the underlying type (W,S) has no loops, see [MVM98, p. 394] using [MR95, Theorem 1.3] and [Ron00, Lemmas 5.1 and 5.2]. We can use Theorem 3.17 to promote this statement to the following topological version.

Theorem 6.4. *Let (W,S) be a Coxeter system whose associated Coxeter diagram is a tree. Then a Moufang topological twin building of type (W,S) is uniquely determined by its topological foundation.*

We stress that we do not claim to be contributing to the solution of the problem that certain Moufang foundations be integrable. We simply state that an *integrable* Moufang foundation whose diagram is a tree endowed with a topology as in Definition 6.2 uniquely determines the topology on its (uniquely determined) twin building.

Proof. By the aforementioned algebraic result any continuous isomorphism of foundations extends to an isomorphism of abstract twin buildings. This isomorphism is continuous, since its type is continuous (see Theorem 3.17). Applying the same argument to its inverse we see that it is a homeomorphism. $\square$

In the sequel we will say that a Moufang topological building is **of tree type** if it is of type (W, S) and the Coxeter diagram of (W, S) is a tree. We use a similar terminology concerning foundations. By means of Theorem 6.4 the classification of Moufang topological twin buildings of tree type is reduced to the following two problems:

(1) Classify topological Moufang foundations of tree type.

(2) Decide, which of these foundations are integrable.

We will carry out this problem for the subclass of split Moufang topological twin buildings in the next section.

6.2 Split foundations and Dynkin diagrams

Throughout this section let k be a local field, i.e. a non-discrete, locally compact, σ-compact Hausdorff field.

Definition 6.5. A topological Moufang foundation $\mathcal{F} = (\{\Delta_J \mid J \in E\}, \{c_J \mid J \in E\}, \{\theta_{jik} \mid \{i,j\}, \{j,k\} \in E\})$ is called **k-split** if each rank one residue of each Δ_J (equipped with the induced topology) is isomorphic as a topological Moufang set to the projective line over k in its natural topology. A Moufang topological twin building is called **k-split** if some (hence any) of its foundations is k-split.

We remark that a foundation $\mathcal{F}$ as above is k-split if and only if all the Δ_J are isomorphic as compact polygons to either

(S-3) the compact projective plane over k;

(S-4) the compact generalized quadrangle associated with $\mathrm{Sp}_4(k)$, or its dual;

(S-6) the compact generalized hexagon associated with the split algebraic group of exceptional type G_2 over k, or its dual.

We now present a classification of k-split Moufang topological twin buildings of tree type along the lines suggested in the last section. In our specific situation, Step (1) is provided by the following result of Mühlherr–Van Maldeghem:

Lemma 6.6 ([MVM98, Proposition 2])**.** *Let*

$$\mathcal{F} = (\{\Delta_J \mid J \in E\}, \{c_J \mid J \in E\}, \{\theta_{jik} \mid \{i,j\}, \{j,k\} \in E\})$$

be a k-split topological Moufang foundation of tree type. Then $\mathcal{F}$ is uniquely determined by the list $\{\Delta_J \mid J \in E\}$.

As far as Step (2) of the classification is concerned, our results on topological Kac-Moody groups now yield the following:

Theorem 6.7. *Every k-split topological Moufang foundation of tree type is integrable.*

Proof. Let $\mathcal{F}$ be a topological k-split Moufang foundation. By the main result of [Müh99] there exists a (two-spherical) split Kac-Moody group $G = G_{\mathcal{D}}(k)$ such that the associated twin building globalizes the abstract foundation underlying $\mathcal{F}$. Equip G with the Kac-Petersen topology and its twin building with the associated quotient topology. In view of Theorem 1 this is a topological twin building. Since the topology on the root subgroups U_α is the standard one by Corollary 5.12(iii), this topological twin building realizes the given topological foundation. $\square$

Combining Lemma 6.6 and Theorem 6.7 we obtain a complete classification of k-split Moufang topological twin buildings of tree type. An efficient way to formulate this classification is in terms of Dynkin diagrams: To this end let (W, S) be a Coxter system of tree type with Coxeter graph $\Gamma = (V, E)$ and $\mathcal{F}$ a k-split Moufang foundation of type (W, S). Then the **Dynkin diagram** $\mathcal{D}(\mathcal{F})$ of $\mathcal{F}$ is the following labelled graphs: The vertex set and the edge set are given by V and E respectively. An edge $J \in E$ is labelled by 3, 4 or 6 according to whether Δ_J is a generalized triangle, quadrangle or hexagon. If the label is 4 or 6 we have to distinguish between the standard split quadrangle/hexagon and its dual; as usual we do this by orienting the corresponding edge into the direction from the long simple root to the short simple root. Then we have:

Theorem 2. *Let k be a local field. The maps $[\Delta] \mapsto [\mathcal{F}(\Delta)]$ respectively $[\mathcal{F}] \to [\mathcal{D}(\mathcal{F})]$ induce bijections between isomorphism classes of:*

(i) *k-split Moufang topological twin buildings of tree type;*

(ii) *k-split topological Moufang foundations of tree types;*

(iii) *simply connected simple $\{3, 4, 6\}$-labelled graphs, where edged labelled 4 or 6 are directed.*

7 Connected topological twin buildings

7.1 Connectedness and smoothness

In this section we will study topological twin buildings (Δ, τ) for which the halves $(\Delta_\pm, \tau|_{\Delta_\pm})$ are connected. By slight abuse of notation we then say that (Δ, τ) is a **connected topological twin building**. In a similar way we also define the notion of a **totally-disconnected topological twin building**. We recall our standing assumption that there are no isolated vertices in the Coxeter diagram of the underlying type (W, S). Our goal is to establish the following dichotomy:

Proposition 7.1. *Every 2-spherical topological twin building (without isolated vertices in the Coxeter diagram) is either connected or totally disconnected.*

We first observe:

Lemma 7.2. *Let (Δ, τ) be a topological twin building.*

(i) *If all panels are connected, then Δ is connected.*

(ii) *If all panels are totally disconnected, then Δ is totally disconnected.*

Proof. If the panels are connected/totally disconnected, then the gallery spaces are connected/totally disconnected by Proposition 3.10. In the former case it follows immediately that the Schubert varieties are connected. In the latter case it follows that the non-stammering galleries of a given type are totally disconnected. Since these are mapped homeomorphically in a one-to-one fashion onto the corresponding Schubert cells, it follows that the Schubert cells are totally disconnected. Now for every $w \in W$ and $c \in \Delta_\pm$,

$$E_{\leq w}(c_0) = \bigcup_{c \in E_{\leq w}(c_0)} (E_w(c) \cap E_{\leq w}(c_0)).$$

The subsets $E_w(c) \cap E_{\leq w}(c_0)$ are open in $E_{\leq w}(c_0)$ and totally disconnected, hence $E_{\leq w}(c_0)$ is totally disconnected itself. The claim follows from the fact that direct limits of compact connected/totally disconnected spaces are connected/totally disconnected. □

In view of Lemma 7.2, the proof of Proposition 7.1 follows from the following statement:

Lemma 7.3. *Let (Δ, τ) be an irreducible spherical topological twin building of rank 2. Then either all panels are connected or all panels are totally disconnected.*

Proof. See [Kra94, 2.2.3], [GKVMW, Proposition 6.13]. □

Natural examples of connected topological twin buildings arise from real and complex split-Kac-Moody groups; these examples are automatically smooth. Here, a connected topological twin building (Δ, τ) is called **smooth** if the panels are (finite-dimensional) real manifolds. Note that by definition, a topological twin building is smooth if and only if its rank two residues are smooth.

Proposition 7.4. *Every connected Moufang topological twin building*[2] *is smooth.*

Proof. By Lemma 7.2 a topological twin building (Δ, τ) is connected if and only if its rank two residues are connected. A connected topological twin building (Δ, τ) is smooth, if its rank two residues are. A rank two residue of a topological twin building is compact if and only if it is spherical by Corollary 3.15. The claim therefore follows from the classification of flag-homogeneous connected compact polygons in [GKK95], [GKK00]. □

Although we will not take advantage of this fact, let us briefly mention that the assumptions of the proposition can be substantially weakened. By [GKK95, Theorem A] every flag-transitive compact connected polygon in Moufang. Therefore by the extension theorem from [MR95] one has:

Corollary 7.5. *Let (Δ, τ) be a connected two-spherical topological twin building. If the rank two residues have flag-transitive automorphism groups, then (Δ, τ) is smooth.*

We do not know any natural condition on twin trees which guarantee smoothness, hence we cannot extend Proposition 7.4 beyond the two-spherical case.

7.2 CW structures of smooth connected twin buildings

An important observation concerning smooth connected twin buildings is that their panels are spheres:

Proposition 7.6 (cf. [GKK95, Theorem 1.6], [Kna90, Lemma 2.1], [Kra94, Proposition 4.1.2])**.** *Let (W, S) be a Coxeter system without isolated points and let Δ be a smooth connected topological twin building of type (W, S). Then each panel of Δ is a sphere.*

Proof. Since compact connected manifolds of positive dimension do not admit cutpoints, each punctured panel is connected. Let $P \subset \Delta_+$ be a panel of type r and let $c_+ \in P$, so that $P = P_r(c_+)$. By hypothesis there exists a type $s \in S$ such that $m_{rs} \geq 3$. For $c_- \in E_1^*(c_+)$ define $0_+ := \mathrm{proj}^*_{P_r(c_+)}(c_-)$ and $0_- := \mathrm{proj}^*_{P_s(c_-)}(c_+)$ and choose $1_- \in P_s(c_-)^\times \cap E_1^*(c_+)$. Proposition 3.23 provides a continuous map

$$\bullet : P_r(c_+)^\times \times P_s(c_-)^\times \to P_r(c_+)^\times.$$

Since $P_s(c_-)^\times$ is a connected manifold, there exists a continuous path $\gamma(t)$ from 1_- to 0_-. Then the map $H_t(x) := x \bullet \gamma(t)$ defines a pseudo-isotopic contraction of $P_r(c_+)^\times$ in the sense of [Har65, p. 186]. Therefore by [Har65, Theorem] there exists $n \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $P_r(c_+)^\times \cong \mathbb{R}^n$ and, thus, $P = P_r(c_+) \cong \mathbb{S}^n$. □

Recall from Corollary 3.7 that panels of the same type are pairwise homeomorphic, so that the following definition is meaningful.

Definition 7.7. Let Δ be a smooth connected topological twin building. For each $s \in S$ the number $d(s) \in \mathbb{N}$ denotes the dimension of an s-panel.

Proposition 7.6 allows one to identify a CW structure on a smooth real twin building and its geometric realization.

---

[2] Recall that a Moufang topological twin building is by definition assumed to be 2-spherical.

Proposition 7.8 ([Kra02, Proposition 7.9], cf. [Kra94, Theorem 4.1.3])**.** *Let (Δ, τ) be a smooth connected topological twin building. Then the combinatorial Schubert decomposition of the halves of $\Delta_\pm$ with respect to base chambers $c_\pm$ are CW decompositions. More precisely, there exists a CW structure on $\Delta_\pm$ with the following properties:*

(i) *if $w \in W$ and $w = s_1 \cdots s_n$ is a reduced expression, then there exists a cell of dimension $d(w) := d(s_1) + \cdots + d(s_n)$ with attaching map*

$$\varphi_w : (D^{d(w)}, S^{d(w)-1}) \to (E_{\leq w}(c_\pm), E_{<w}(c_\pm));$$

the corresponding open cell is the Schubert cell $E_w(c_\pm)$;

(ii) *every cell is of the form φ_w for some $w \in W$.*

The proof of the proposition is based on the findings of Section 3.3 and the following observation.

Lemma 7.9 ([Kra94, Lemma 6.2.12])**.** *Let $p : E \to B$ be an $\mathbb{S}^d$-fibre bundle over a CW complex B, which admits a global section $s : B \to E$. Then there exists a unique CW structure on E with the following properties:*

(i) *$s(B)$ is a subcomplex of E and $s : B \to s(B)$ is an isomorphism of CW complexes.*

(ii) *Let B^{k-1} be the $(k-1)$-skeleton of B and $\mu : (D^k, S^{k-1}) \to (B, B^{k-1})$ be a k-cell. Then there exists a unique $(k+d)$-cell $\hat{\mu} : (D^{k+d}, \mathbb{S}^{k+d-1}) \to (E, E^{k+d-1})$ with*

$$\hat{\mu}(D^{k+d}) = p^{-1}(\mu(D^k)).$$

(iii) *Every cell is either of type (i) or type (ii).*

Proof of Proposition 7.8. Applying Lemma 7.9 to the Bott–Samelson desingularization (Proposition 3.10) yields a CW structure on each gallery space $\mathrm{Gall}(s_1, ..., s_k; c_\pm)$ by induction on k starting from the trivial CW structure of the point. Composing the attaching maps with the respective endpoint maps (Remark 3.11) one obtains a CW structure on Schubert varieties with center $c_\pm$; by (TTB3+) these patch together to a CW structure on $\Delta_\pm$. ☐

Remark 7.10 (cf. [Kna90, Theorem])**.** Proposition 7.8 yields severe restrictions on the possible values of the dimensions $d(s)$, because $d(w)$ has to be independent of the reduced expression for w. For instance, $d(\cdot)$ is constant on subsets of S contained in a single W-conjugacy class, i.e., subsets of the connected components of the subgraph of the Dynkin diagram containing the simple edges only, as the dihedral group $\langle s, t \mid s^2 = t^2 = (st)^3 = 1 \rangle$ admits the relation $sts = tst$.

Another application of Proposition 7.8 concerns the geometric realizations $|\Delta_\pm|$ of the two halves of the twin building defined as follows: Let $\Delta = ((\Delta_+, \delta_+), (\Delta_-, \delta_-), \delta^*)$ be a topological twin building of type (W, S) and $n := |S| - 1$. Define the standard simplex and its faces as

$$\blacktriangle^n := \{v \in \mathbb{R}^{n+1} \mid \sum_{i=1}^{n+1} v_i = 1\},$$

respectively,

$$\blacktriangle^n[j] := \left\{ v \in \mathbb{R}^{n+1} \mid \sum_{i=1}^{n+1} v_i = 1, \quad v_j = 0 \right\}, \quad (j = 1, \ldots, n+1).$$

Then the geometric realisations $|\Delta_\pm|$ of $\Delta_\pm$ are given by the following construction: Enumerate $S = \{s_1, \ldots, s_{n+1}\}$, equip $\Delta_\pm \times \blacktriangle^n$ with the product topology and identify the jth faces of chambers which are contained in the same s_j-panel. In the sequel we will denote by $q : \Delta_\pm \times \blacktriangle^n \to |\Delta_\pm|$

the canonical quotient maps.

If we equip $\blacktriangle^n$ with the CW structure given by its faces, then the product CW structure on $\Delta_\pm \times \blacktriangle$ descend to the geometric realizations $|\Delta_\pm|$. Observe that the subsets

$$|E|_{\leq w}(c) := q(E_{\leq w}(c) \times \blacktriangle^n), |E|_{<w}(c) := q(E_{<w}(c) \times \blacktriangle^n).$$

are subcomplexes of $|\Delta_\pm|$ for every $w \in W$ and $c \in \Delta_\pm$. Since the inclusion of a CW subcomplex is a cofibration (see e.g. [Spa66, Theorem 7.12]), we obtain:

Corollary 7.11 (cf. [Mit88, Theorem 2.22(c)])**.** *For every $w \in W$ and $c \in \Delta_\pm$ the inclusion $|E|_{<w}(c) \hookrightarrow |E|_{\leq w}(c)$ is a cofibration.*

7.3 A topological Solomon–Tits theorem

The goal of this subsection is to establish the following topological variant of the Solomon-Tits theorem:

Theorem 7.12 ([Kra02, Corollary 7.11])**.** *Let Δ be a smooth connected topological twin building of type (W, S), whose Coxeter graph contains no isolated points. Then $|\Delta_\pm|$ is a homotopy sphere of dimension $d(w_0) + |S| - 1$ if W is finite and $w_0 \in W$ is the longest word, and contractible if W is infinite.*

We start with some preliminary observations and reductions. Firstly, direct limits in the category of k_ω spaces commute with finite products and with quotient maps [FT77, GGH10]. We deduce that for any fixed chamber $c \in \Delta_\pm$,

$$|\Delta_\pm| = \varinjlim |E|_{\leq w}(c).$$

If W is infinite, then we even obtain

$$|\Delta_\pm| \quad = \quad \varinjlim |E|_{<w}(c). \tag{7.1}$$

The key step in the proof of Theorem 7.12 is to show that for every non-maximal $w \in W$ the quotient

$$B_w(c) := |E|_{\leq w}(c)/|E|_{<w}(c)$$

is contractible. Let us assume this for the moment and explain how to deduce Theorem 7.12: We first claim that our assumption implies that $|E|_{<w}(c)$ itself is always contractible even if w is maximal. Indeed, for $l(w) \leq 1$ this is clear. Now let $l := l(w) > 1$ and let $w_1, \ldots, w_N$ be the maximal elements with respect to the Bruhat order subject to the condition $w_j < w$. By induction hypothesis, $|E|_{<w_j}(c)$ is contractible for every $j = 1, \ldots, N$. Since $w_j < w$ the w_j are non-maximal, hence by our assumption also $|E|_{\leq w_j}(c)/|E|_{<w_j}(c)$ is contractible for every j. In view of Corollary 7.11 this implies that each of the sets $|E|_{\leq w_j}(c)$ is contractible. Since

$$|E|_{\leq w_j}(c) \cap |E|_{\leq w_l}(c) = |E|_{\leq \inf\{w_j, w_l\}}(c)$$

the same argument shows that finite intersections of the $|E|_{\leq w_j}(c)$ are contractible. Using Corollary 7.11 this implies

$$|E|_{<w}(c) = \bigcup_{j=1}^{n} |E|_{\leq w_j}(c) \simeq \bigvee_{j=1}^{n} |E|_{\leq w_j}(c) \simeq \{*\}$$

and establishes our claim. In the infinite case we can combine our claim and (7.1) to deduce

$$|\Delta_\pm| \simeq \{*\};$$

if W is finite with longest word w_0 then another application of Corollary 7.11 yields

$$|\Delta_\pm| \cong |E|_{\leq w_0}(c)/|E|_{<w_0}(c) = B_{w_0}(c).$$

We have thus reduced the proof of Theorem 7.12 to the following lemma:

Lemma 7.13 ([Kra02, Proposition 7.10], cf. [Kna90, 2.10–2.15], [Mit88, Theorem 2.16])**.** *Let* $w \in W$*. Then* $B_w(c) \simeq S^{d(w)+|S|-1}$ *if* w *is maximal and* $B_w(c)$ *is contractible otherwise.*

Proof. We fix an enumeration $S = \{s_1, \dots, s_N\}$ and for $1 \leq i \leq N$ denote by

$$\blacktriangle^{N-1}[i] := \{(t_1, \dots, t_N) \in \mathbb{R}^n \mid \sum_{j=0}^{N} t_j = 1, t_i = 0\}$$

the ith face of the standard $(N-1)$-simplex. We then denote by $q : \Delta_\pm \times \blacktriangle^{N-1} \to |\Delta_\pm|$ the quotient map given by identifying the i-th faces of s_i-adjacent chambers. Furthermore we denote by $\pi : |E|_{\leq w}(c) \to B_w(c)$ the canonical projection and set

$$p := \pi \circ q|_{E_{\leq w}(c) \times \blacktriangle^{N-1}} : E_{\leq w}(c) \times \blacktriangle^{N-1} \to B_w(c).$$

We observe that p maps all points in $E_{<w}(c) \times \blacktriangle$ to the basepoint $* := p(c)$ of $B_w(c)$. In particular p factors through a map

$$p_0 : E_{\leq w}(c)/E_{<w}(c) \times \blacktriangle^{N-1} \to B_w(c).$$

Since $E_{\leq w}(c) \times \blacktriangle^{N-1}$ is compact, the maps p and consequently p_0 are quotient maps.

Claim 1: If $l(ws_i) < l(w)$ then $p(d, (t_j)) = *$ for all $d \in E_w(c)$ and $(t_j) = (t_1, \dots, t_N) \in \blacktriangle^N[i]$ with $t_i = 0$.
Indeed, if $l(ws_i) < l(w)$ then there exists a reduced expression $w = r_1 \cdots r_M$ with $r_j \in S$, $r_M = s_i$. Let $(c = x_0, x_1, \dots, x_{M-1}, x_m = d)$ be a gallery of type $(r_1, \dots, r_M)$. Then $x_{M-1} \in E_{ws_i}(c) \subset E_{<w}(c)$. Since x_{m-1} and d share their ith face in $|E|_{\leq w}(c)$, the claim follows.

Claim 2: If $d \sim_i e$ for some $d \in E_w(c)$ and $e \in E_{\leq w}(c)$, then $l(ws_i) < l(w)$.
For $e \in E_{<w}(c)$ this is clear. Now assume $d, e \in E_w(c)$ and $l(ws_i) = l(w) + 1$; take a reduced expression $(r_1, \dots, r_M)$ for w and let $(c = c_0, \dots, c_M = d)$ be a gallery of this type. Then $(c, \dots, c_{M-1}, d, e)$ is of reduced type, whence $l(\delta(c, e)) < l(w)$ contradicting the choice of e.

Now let $I^- := \{i \in \{1, \dots, N\} \mid l(ws_i) < l(w)\}$ and

$$\blacktriangle^{N-1}[I^-] := \bigcup_{i \in I^-} \blacktriangle^{N-1}[i].$$

By Claim 2 the map p_0 maps the set

$$[c] \times \blacktriangle^{n-1} \cup E_{\leq w}/E_{<w}(c) \times \blacktriangle^{N-1}[I^-]$$

to $*$ and is one-to-one on the complement of this set. By Proposition 7.8 we also have

$$E_{\leq w}(c)/E_{<w}(c) \cong S^{d(w)}.$$

Since p_0 is a covering map we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
B_w(c) &\cong p_0(E_{\leq w}(c)/E_{<w}(c) \times \blacktriangle^{N-1}) \\
&\cong \frac{E_{\leq w}(c)/E_{<w}(c) \times \blacktriangle^{N-1}}{[c] \times \blacktriangle^{n-1} \cup E_{\leq w}/E_{<w}(c) \times \blacktriangle^{N-1}[I^-]} \\
&\cong (S^{d(w)} \times \blacktriangle^{N-1})/(\{p\} \times \blacktriangle^{N-1} \cup S^{d(w)} \times \blacktriangle^{N-1}[I^-])
\end{aligned}$$

If w is maximal, then $I^- = \{1, \dots, N\}$, hence

$$B_w(c) \cong (S^{d(w)} \times \blacktriangle^{N-1})/(\{p\} \times \blacktriangle^{N-1} \cup S^{d(w)} \times \partial\blacktriangle^{N-1}) \cong S^{d(w)+N-1}.$$

Otherwise we can find $i \in \{1, \ldots, N\} \setminus I^-$; then we obtain a contracting homotopy

$$H_t : (S^{d(w)} \times \blacktriangle^{N-1})/(\{p\} \times \blacktriangle^{N-1} \cup S^{d(w)} \times \blacktriangle^{N-1}[I^-]) \circlearrowleft$$

by the formula

$$H_t([x, (t_1, \ldots, t_N)]) := [x, ((1-t)t_1, \ldots t_i + t(1-t_i), \ldots, (1-t)t_N)].$$

□

7.4 Classification of connected Moufang twin buildings

The goal of this subsection is to classify connected Moufang topological twin buildings. We have seen already in the split case that loops (and isolated vertices) in the underlying Coxeter diagram cause problems for the classification; we thus exclude these:

Definition 7.14. A Coxeter diagram is called **admissible** if it contains no loops and no isolated vertices. A (twin) building is called **of admissible type** if its underlying Coxeter diagram is admissible.

We will now classify all connected Moufang topological twin buildings of admissible type. To this end, let us call a topological Moufang foundation **connected** if all its rank 2 residues are connected. Note that by Lemma 7.2 a Moufang topological twin building is connected if and only if its foundation is connected. Connected topological Moufang foundations are essentially known. To make this statement precise, let us first recall that connected Moufang twin buildings of rank 2, a.k.a. **compact Moufang polygons** have been classified, see [GKK00]. One has the following consequence of the classification:

Proposition 7.15. *Given a topological Moufang polygon X there exists a unique connected, algebraically simply-connected*[3] *simple Lie group $G(X)$ of real rank two such that $X \cong \Delta(G(X), B(X))$ as topological buildings, where $B(X)$ is a minimal parabolic subgroup of $G(X)$.*

Using the proposition one easily constructs all possible connected topological Moufang foundations using the classification of simple real Lie groups. One then has to decide whether two connected Moufang foundations are isomorphic. We will not discuss this isomorphism problem here. See [Kno05], [M9̈9] for the currently available state of the art. Rather, let us explain how the solution of the isomorphism problem for connected Moufang foundations [Kra03] yields a classification of connected topological twin buildings.

Theorem 3. *Every finite-dimensional connected Moufang foundation of admissible type is integrable. Moreover, there are explicit bijections between isomorphism classes of*

(i) *connected Moufang foundation of admissible type;*

(ii) *connected Moufang twin buildings of admissible type;*

(iii) *pairs $(G^{\mathbb{C}}, \sigma)$, where $G^{\mathbb{C}}$ is the adjoint form of a complex split Kac-Moody group of admissible type over $\mathbb{C}$ and σ is a non-trivial continuous involution of $G^{\mathbb{C}}$ of the first kind.*

We remind the reader that an involution of a complex split Kac-Moody group $G^{\mathbb{C}}$ is called **of the first kind** (cf. [KW92]) if it preserves the two conjugacy classes of Borel subgroups in $G^{\mathbb{C}}$. By definition, an isomorphism of pairs $(G_1^{\mathbb{C}}, \sigma_1)$, $(G_2^{\mathbb{C}}, \sigma_2)$ is an isomorphism $G_1^{\mathbb{C}} \to G_2^{\mathbb{C}}$ preserving the two conjugacy classes of Borel subgroups and intertwining σ_1 and σ_2. We remark that the classification of involutions of the first kind for a given complex split Kac–Moody groups reduces to a similar classification problem for the corresponding complex Kac–Moody Lie algebra, hence is a purely algebraic problem, see [KW92].

---

[3] This means that $G(X) = \mathbb{G}(\mathbb{R})$ for an algebraic group $\mathbb{G}$ over $\mathbb{R}$ with $\pi_1(\mathbb{G}(\mathbb{C})) = \{e\}$. Note that $\pi_1(G(X))$ can still be infinite.

The proof of Theorem 3 is by reduction to the split case via Galois descent. In the spherical case this argument is well-known, see e.g. [Hel01, Chapter X, Exercises F]. In the following we will explain briefly the necessary modifications in the non-spherical case.

There is an obvious way how to pass from the objects in (ii) of Theorem 3 to the objects in (i), and by Theorem 6.4 no information is lost in this process. We will now explain how to pass from the objects in (iii) to the objects in (ii) and from the objects in (i) to the objects in (iii). From the construction it will be obvious that all cycles in the triangle (i) $\rightsquigarrow$ (iii) $\rightsquigarrow$ (ii) $\rightsquigarrow$ (i) provide the identity.

First let $(G^{\mathbb{C}}, \sigma)$ as in (iii). It follows from [KW92, Lemma 5.7] that there exists a σ-stable torus $T^{\mathbb{C}}$ in $G^{\mathbb{C}}$. We then define $G := (G^{\mathbb{C}})^{\sigma}$ and $T := (T^{\mathbb{C}})^{\sigma}$. According to [Rém02, Theorem 12.4.3] there exists a RGD system $(T, \{U_\alpha\})$ for G, where α now ranges over the relative real roots (cf. [Rém02, 12.6.2, 12.6.3]). We denote by $B_\pm$ the corresponding Borel groups and observe that $B_\pm = (B_\pm^{\mathbb{C}})^{\sigma}$ for a suitable pair of Borel groups $B_\pm^{\mathbb{C}}$ of $G^{\mathbb{C}}$. We now equip G with the restriction of the Kac–Peterson topology and the halves of the twin building $\Delta = \Delta(G, T, \{U_\alpha\})$ with the quotient topology. Then we have:

Proposition 7.16. Δ *is a topological twin building.*

Proof. We have to check Conditions (i)–(iv) of Theorem 4.8.

(i) The groups $B_\pm$ are closed in $B_\pm^{\mathbb{C}}$. Since the latter are closed in $G^{\mathbb{C}}$ and since σ is continuous, the $B_\pm$ are closed in G.

(ii) follows from the corresponding property for $G^{\mathbb{C}}$.

(iii) By Proposition 5.19 multiplication induces a homeomorphisms

$$U_+^{\mathbb{C}} \times T^{\mathbb{C}} \times U_-^{\mathbb{C}} \to B_+^{\mathbb{C}} B_-^{\mathbb{C}}.$$

But then the statement follows from the fact that restriction of a homeomorphism to a subset is a homeomorphism onto its image.

(iv) In view of Remark 5.13 we can argue as in the proof of Corollary 5.12(ii). □

Remark 7.17. Δ is also obviously a topological twin building when equipped with the subspace topology coming from the complex twin building $\Delta^{\mathbb{C}}$. It then follows by Corollary 3.18 that the two topologies on Δ coincide. A priori, this is not obvious.

It is easy to see that Δ is in fact a connected smooth real Moufang twin buildings. Here the key observation is that the rank one and two subgroups are contained in a spherical subgroup of $G^{\mathbb{C}}$. By Remark 5.13 the topology induced on them is therefore the Lie group topology, and the panels carry the corresponding quotient topology. Using [Hel01, Chapter X, Exercises F, Table VI] it is also easy to see that if the root system of $G^{\mathbb{C}}$ is of admissible type then so is the relative root system, as Galois descent does not create loops where the are none. Thus the above construction indeed associates with every pair $(G^{\mathbb{C}}, \sigma)$ as in (iii) a connected smooth real Moufang twin buildings of admissible type.

We now turn to the converse direction, starting with some preliminary terminology. Given a complex split Kac-Moody group $G^{\mathbb{C}}$ with standard RGD system $(\{U_\alpha\}_{\alpha \in \Phi^{re}}, T)$ we denote by Π a choice of simple roots and define a diagram of topological groups as follows: Given $\alpha, \beta \in \Pi$ with $\alpha \neq \beta$ we define vertices by $G_\alpha := \varphi_\alpha(\mathrm{SL}_2(\mathbb{C}))$ and $G_{\alpha\beta} := \langle G_\alpha \cup G_\beta \rangle$. Moreover, we define arrows $\iota_{\alpha\beta} \colon G_\alpha \hookrightarrow G_{\alpha\beta}$ between these vertices using the canonical inclusions. We call the resulting diagram the **Curtis–Tits diagram** of $G^{\mathbb{C}}$; by Theorem 5.18 the group $G^{\mathbb{C}}$ is the direct limit of this diagram. This applies in particular to the case where $G^{\mathbb{C}}$ is a complex semisimple Lie group.

We now explain how to pass from (i) to (iii). For this we fix a foundation $\mathcal{F}$ of tree type (W, S) as in (i). Denote by V respectively E the edges of the Coxeter graph of (W, S) and assume

$$\mathcal{F} = (\{\Delta_J \mid J \in E\}, \{c_J \mid J \in E\}, \{\theta_{jik} \mid \{i,j\}, \{j,k\} \in E\}).$$

We now define abstracts groups G_i, G_{ij} for all $i, j \in V$. Assume first that $\{i,j\} \in E$; then we define $G_{\{i,j\}} := G(\Delta_{\{i,j\}})$ (see Proposition 7.15) and denote by $G^i_{i,j}$ the setwise stabilizer of the i-panel of $c_{i,j}$ in $G_{i,j}$. We observe that the groups $G^i_{i,j}$ are isomorphic for all j with $\{i,j\} \in E$; we denote by G_i one of these groups and choose isomorphisms $G_i \to G^i_{i,j}$ for all such j. We thereby obtain embeddings $\iota_{ij} : G_i \to G_{ij}$ for all $\{i,j\} \in E$. Now for $\{i,j\} \in V^2 \setminus E$, $i \neq j$ we set $G_{ij} := G_i \times G_j$ and let $\iota_{ij} : G_i \to G_{ij}$ denote the standard inclusion. We refer to the resulting diagram $D_{\mathcal{F}} := (G_i, G_{i,j}; \iota_{ij})$ as the diagram associated with the foundation $\mathcal{F}$. We now topologize $D_{\mathcal{F}}$ as follows: If $\{i,j\} \in E$, then we equip G_{ij} with the compact-open topology with respect to the action on $\Delta_{\{i,j\}}$. The induced (Lie group) topology on G_i does not depend on the choice of embedding ι_{ij}. We thus obtain a topologization of the G_i and equip G_{ij} with the product topology provided $\{i,j\} \in V^2 \setminus E$ and $i \neq j$. Using these definitions we may consider $D_{\mathcal{F}}$ as a diagram of k_ω groups and continous maps (in fact, Lie groups and smooth maps).

We now apply the universal complexification functor to the diagram $D_{\mathcal{F}}$ to obtain a diagram $D_{\mathcal{F}}^{\mathbb{C}}$ with groups $G_{ij}^{\mathbb{C}}$, $G_i^{\mathbb{C}}$. By construction, there exists a unique (non-trivial) involution σ_0 of the diagram $D_{\mathcal{F}}^{\mathbb{C}}$ with $(D_{\mathcal{F}}^{\mathbb{C}})^{\sigma_0} = D_{\mathcal{F}}$. We denote by $G^{\mathbb{C}}$ the direct limit of the diagram $D_{\mathcal{F}}^{\mathbb{C}}$ in the category of topological groups and by σ the involution of $G^{\mathbb{C}}$ induced by σ_0. Now we claim:

Lemma 7.18. *The group $G^{\mathbb{C}}$ is a complex split Kac-Moody group of admissible type over $\mathbb{C}$.*

Proof. By construction the groups $G_{ij}^{\mathbb{C}}$ are complex semisimple Lie groups. If their complex rank is 2 and all inclusions are standard, then the diagram is already a Curtis–Tits diagram and we can conclude by Theorem 5.18.

Otherwise we modify the diagram as follows: For every i with $\mathrm{rk}_{\mathbb{C}}(G_i^{\mathbb{C}}) > 1$ we denote by $((G_i^{\mathbb{C}})_\alpha, (G_i^{\mathbb{C}})_{\alpha,\beta}, \iota_{i,\alpha,\beta})$ the associated Curtis–Tits diagram. We now define an index set J by

$$J := \{i \,|\, \mathrm{rk}_{\mathbb{C}}(G_i^{\mathbb{C}}) = 1\} \cup \{(i,\alpha) \,|\, \mathrm{rk}_{\mathbb{C}}(G_i^{\mathbb{C}}) > 1, \alpha \in \Pi_i\}.$$

For $j \in J$ we set $H_j := G_j^{\mathbb{C}}$ if $j \in V$ and $H_j := (G_i^{\mathbb{C}})_\alpha$ if $j = (i,\alpha)$.

By the Curtis–Tits theorem 5.18 the group $G^{\mathbb{C}}$ is generated by the H_j, $j \in J$, and it remains to encode the relations. To this end we define for all $(j,k) \in J^2$, $j \neq k$ groups $H_{j,k}$ and maps $\iota_{j,k} : H_j \to H_{j,k}$ as follows: If $j, k \in V$ then we set $H_{jk} := G_{jk}^{\mathbb{C}}$ with the obvious inclusions. If $j := (i_1, \alpha_1)$, $k := (i_2, \alpha_2)$ then we define $H_{j,k}$ to be the group generated by the images of $H_{(i_1.\alpha_1)}$ and $H_{(i_2.\alpha_2)}$ in $G_{i_1 i_2}^{\mathbb{C}}$. Finally, if $j = i$ and $k = (i_2, \alpha_2)$, then we define $H_{j,k}$ to be the group generated by the images of H_i and $H_{i_2.\alpha_2}$ in $G_{ii_2}^{\mathbb{C}}$.

This takes care of all relations, since any relation is a product of relations contained in rank two subgroups, again by the Curtis–Tits theorem 5.18. We have thus realized $G^{\mathbb{C}}$ as the limit of a diagram $(H_i, H_{ij}, \iota_{ij})$ of complex semisimple groups with $\mathrm{rk}_{\mathbb{C}}(H_i) = 1$ and $\mathrm{rk}_{\mathbb{C}}(H_{ij}) = 2$. The diagram may not yet be a Curtis–Tits diagram, since the ι_{ij} might not be the standard embeddings. However, this is easily corrected replacing the H_i by suitable conjugates in a compatible way, which by [Dun05], [Müh99], [Tit92] is possible since the underlying Coxeter diagram contains no loops. □

In order to finish our construction it remains only to show:

Lemma 7.19. *The involution σ is of the first kind.*

Proof. Let P_i denote the stabilizer of the base chamber in G_i: choose $P_{ij} < G_{ij}$ in such a way that $\triangle_{ij} = G_{ij}/P_{ij}$ provided $(i,j) \in E$, and set $P_{ij} = P_i \times P_j$ otherwise. Let $P_{ij}^{\mathbb{C}}$ denote the complexification of P_{ij} in $G_{ij}^{\mathbb{C}}$. Then there exists a unique Borel subgroup in $G^{\mathbb{C}}$ containing all the $P_{ij}^{\mathbb{C}}$. Since σ stabilizes all P_{ij}, it preserves the $P_{ij}^{\mathbb{C}}$, hence stabilizes this Borel subgroup. □

At this point we have provided the full circle of constructions (i) $\rightsquigarrow$ (iii) $\rightsquigarrow$ (ii) $\rightsquigarrow$ (i). It remains to show that the loops (i) $\rightsquigarrow$ (iii) $\rightsquigarrow$ (ii) $\rightsquigarrow$ (i) and (iii) $\rightsquigarrow$ (ii) $\rightsquigarrow$ (i) $\rightsquigarrow$ (iii) induce the identity. This is, however, is clear by the classical theory in [Hel01, Chapter X, Exercises F] plus the Curtis–Tits theorem 5.18.

References

[AB08] Peter Abramenko, Kenneth S. Brown. *Buildings, theory and applications*, vol. 248 of *Graduate Texts in Mathematics*. Springer. 2008.

[AM97] Peter Abramenko, Bernhard Mühlherr. Présentations de certaines BN-paires jumelées comme sommes amalgamées. *C. R. Acad. Sci. Paris, Série I* **327** (1997), pp. 701 – 706.

[BK95] Richard Bödi, Linus Kramer. On homomorphisms between generalized polygons. *Geom. Dedicata* **58** (1995), pp. 1–14.

[Bou89] Nicolas Bourbaki. *Groupes et algèbres de Lie I - III*. Springer. English translation. 1989.

[BS87] Keith Burns, Ralf Spatzier. On topological Tits buildings and their classification. *Inst. Hautes Études Sci. Pub. Math.* **65** (1987), pp. 5–34.

[Cap09] Pierre-Emmanuel Caprace. *"Abstract" homomorphisms of (split) Kac–Moody groups*, vol. 198. Memoirs of the AMS. 2009.

[CR09] Pierre-Emmanuel Caprace, Bertrand Rémy. Groups with a root group datum. *Innov. Incidence Geom.* **9** (2009), pp. 5 – 77.

[DMS09] Tom De Medts, Yoav Segev. A course on Moufang sets. *Innov. Incidence Geom.* **9** (2009), pp. 79–122.

[Dun05] J. Dunlap. *Uniqueness of Curtis–Phan–Tits amalgams*. Ph.D. thesis, Bowling Green State University. 2005.

[FT77] Stanley P. Franklin, Barbara V. Smith Thomas. A survey on k_ω-spaces. *Topology Proceedings* **2** (1977), pp. 111 – 124.

[GGH10] Helge Glöckner, Ralf Gramlich, Tobias Hartnick. Final group topologies, Kac–Moody groups and Pontryagin duality. *Israel J. Math.* **177** (2010), pp. 49 – 102.

[GHM11] Ralf Gramlich, Max Horn, Bernhard Mühlherr. Abstract involutions of algebraic groups and of Kac-Moody groups. *J. Group Theory* **14** (2011), pp. 213–249.

[GKK95] T. Grundhöfer, N. Knarr, L. Kramer. Flag-homogeneous compact connected polygons. *Geom. Dedicata* **55** (1995), pp. 95–114.

[GKK00] T. Grundhöfer, N. Knarr, L. Kramer. Flag-homogeneous compact connected polygons. II. *Geom. Dedicata* **83** (2000)(1-3), pp. 1–29.

[GKVMW] T. Grundhöfer, L. Kramer, H. Van Maldeghem, R. M. Weiss. Compact totally disconnected Moufang buildings. *Tohoku Math. J.* To appear.

[Glö03] Helge Glöckner. Direct limit Lie groups and manifolds. *J. Math. Kyoto Univ.* **43** (2003), pp. 1–26.

[Har65] O. G. Harrold, Jr. Pseudo-isotopically contractible spaces. *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.* **16** (1965), pp. 186–187.

[Har06] Tobias Hartnick. *Moufang topological twin buildings*. Master's thesis, Technische Universität Darmstadt. 2006.

[Hel01] S. Helgason. *Differential geometry, Lie groups, and symmetric spaces*, vol. 34 of *Graduate Studies in Mathematics*. American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI. 2001.

[Hor09] Max Horn. *Involutions of Kac–Moody groups*. Ph.D. thesis, Technische Universität Darmstadt. 2009.

[Hum92] James E. Humphreys. *Reflection groups and Coxeter groups*. Cambridge University Press. 1992.

[Kac90] Victor G. Kac. *Infinite dimensional Lie algebras*. Cambridge University Press. 1990.

[Kna90] Norbert Knarr. The nonexistence of certain topological polygons. *Forum Math.* **2** (1990), pp. 603–612.

[Kno05] Rafael Knop. *The geometry of Moufang sets*. Ph.D. thesis, MLU Halle–Wittenberg. 2005.

[KP83a] Victor G. Kac, Dale H. Peterson. Infinite flag varieties and conjugacy theorems. In *Proc. Nat. Acad. Sci. USA*, vol. 80, pp. 1778 – 1782. 1983.

[KP83b] Victor G. Kac, Dale H. Peterson. Regular function on certain infinite-dimensional groups. *Arithmetic and geometry Vol. II, Progr. Math.* **36** (1983). Boston, Birkhäuser.

[Kra94] Linus Kramer. *Compact Polygons*. Ph.D. thesis, Eberhard-Karls-Universität Tübingen. 1994.

[Kra02] Linus Kramer. Loop groups and twin buildings. *Geom. Dedicata* **92** (2002), pp. 145 – 178.

[Kra03] Linus Kramer. Two-transitive Lie groups. *J. Reine Angew. Math.* **563** (2003), pp. 83–113.

[KW92] Victor G. Kac, John S. P. Wang. On automorphisms of Kac–Moody algebras and groups. *Advances in Mathematics* **92** (1992), pp. 129 – 195.

[M$\ddot{9}$9] Bernhard Mühlherr. *On the existence of* 2*-spherical twin buildings*. habilitation thesis, TU Dortmund. 1999.

[Mit88] Stephen A. Mitchell. Quillen's theorem on buildings and the loops on a symmetric space. *Enseign. Math.* **34** (1988), pp. 123–166.

[MR95] Bernhard Mühlherr, Mark Ronan. Local to global structure in twin buildings. *Invent. Math.* **122** (1995), pp. 71–81.

[Müh99] Bernhard Mühlherr. Locally split and locally finite twin buildings of 2-spherical type. *J. Reine Angew. Math.* **511** (1999), pp. 119–143.

[MVM98] Bernhard Mühlherr, Hendrik Van Maldeghem. On certain twin buildings over tree diagrams. *Bull. Belg. Math. Soc. Simon Stevin* **5** (1998)(2-3), pp. 393–402. Finite geometry and combinatorics (Deinze, 1997).

[Ron00] Mark A. Ronan. Local isometries of twin buildings. *Math. Z.* **234** (2000)(3), pp. 435–455.

[RT87] M. A. Ronan, J. Tits. Building buildings. *Math. Ann.* **278** (1987), pp. 291–306.

[RT99] M. A. Ronan, J. Tits. Twin trees. II. Local structure and a universal construction. *Israel J. Math.* **109** (1999), pp. 349–377.

[Rém02] Bertrand Rémy. *Groupes de Kac–Moody déployés et presque déployés*, vol. 277 of *Astérisque*. Société mathématique de France. 2002.

[SBG$^+$95] Helmut Salzmann, Dieter Betten, Theo Grundhöfer, Hermann Hähl, Rainer Löwen, Markus Stroppel. *Compact projective planes*, vol. 21 of *de Gruyter Expositions in Mathematics*. Walter de Gruyter & Co., Berlin. 1995.

[Spa66] Edwin H. Spanier. *Algebraic topology*. McGraw-Hill Book Company, New York. 1966.

[Ste68] Robert Steinberg. *Lectures on Chevalley groups*. Yale University. Mimeographed lecture notes. 1968.

[Tim01] Franz Georg Timmesfeld. *Abstract root subgroups and simple groups of Lie type*, vol. 95 of *Monographs in Mathematics*. Birkhäuser Verlag, Basel. 2001.

[Tit52] J. Tits. Sur les groupes doublement transitifs continus. *Comment. Math. Helv.* **26** (1952), pp. 203–224.

[Tit55] J. Tits. Sur certaines classes d'espaces homogènes de groupes de Lie. *Acad. Roy. Belg. Cl. Sci. Mém. Coll. in* 8° **29** (1955), p. 268.

[Tit56] J. Tits. Sur les groupes doublement transitifs continus: correction et compléments. *Comment. Math. Helv.* **30** (1956), pp. 234–240.

[Tit74] Jacques Tits. *Buildings of spherical type and finite BN-pairs*. Lecture Notes in Mathematics, Vol. 386. Springer-Verlag, Berlin. 1974.

[Tit81] Jacques Tits. A local approach to buildings. In *The Geometric Vein – The Coxeter Festschrift* (edited by Chandler Davis, Branko Grünbaum, F. A. Sherk), pp. 519–547. Springer, New York. 1981.

[Tit87] Jacques Tits. Uniqueness and presentation of Kac–Moody groups over fields. *J. Algebra* **105** (1987), pp. 542 – 573.

[Tit92] Jacques Tits. Twin buildings and groups of Kac-Moody type. In *Groups, combinatorics & geometry (Durham, 1990)*, vol. 165 of *London Math. Soc. Lecture Note Ser.*, pp. 249–286. Cambridge Univ. Press, Cambridge. 1992.

[TW02] Jacques Tits, Richard M. Weiss. *Moufang polygons*. Springer Monographs in Mathematics. Springer-Verlag, Berlin. 2002.

[Wei95] André Weil. *Basic number theory*. Classics in Mathematics. Springer-Verlag, Berlin. Reprint of the second (1973) edition. 1995.

Authors' adresses:
Tobias Hartnick, Technion, Department of Mathematics, Haifa, Israel
`hartnick@tx.technion.ac.il`
Ralf Köhl, Universität Gießen, Mathematisches Institut, Arndtstraße 2, 35392 Gießen, Germany
`ralf.koehl@math.uni-giessen.de`
Andreas Mars, TU Darmstadt, Fachbereich Mathematik, Schloßgartenstraße 7, 64289 Darmstadt, Germany
`mars@mathematik.tu-darmstadt.de`